The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1919 No. 2811

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 775

EDITORIALS:
The Poetical Cult of Lincoln 777
The Madness at Versailles 778
A Secretary of Education 780
The Passing of Sherry's 781

WHY WILSON WAS DEFEATED AT PARIS. By Lincoln Colcord 782

ENGLAND IN REVOLUTION. By Richard Roberts 784

MEREDITH AFTER TEN YEARS. By Samuel C. Chew 786

JAPAN AFTER THE WAR. By J. Ingram Bryan 788

MAY COMES LAUGHING. By Henrietta Jewett Keith 790

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 790

CORRESPONDENCE 791

LITERATURE:
Our Newest Poets 793
Heretics of War 793
Far Eastern Trails 794
The Technique of Play-Making 795
Records of New York Jewry 796
The Middle-Aged in War-Time 796

BOOKS IN BRIEF 797

DRAMA:
Le Coq d'Or and Roman Pantomime. By Harold L. Cleasby 799

FINANCE:
Readjusting Commodity Prices. By William Justus Boies 800

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 801

DARING the accusation of pro-Germanism and Bolshevism, Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, has told the simple truth about the peace treaty in saying to a correspondent of the Associated Press in London that "there are no terms written in the treaty that can bring peace to Europe." The real treaty of peace, he says, "will be the plan whereby Europe will be able to get machinery, rolling stock, and raw materials, and be placed in a position to help herself." Nowhere in his long interview does he except Germany. In fact, he specifically states that "the re-starting of the wheels of industry *everywhere in Europe* is a pre-requisite to security." Like everybody else who has looked beneath the surface in Europe, he is amazed at the critical character of the situation and the failure of America to understand it, and he apparently realizes that there is nothing in the peace treaty but the incentive to bitter hate and the ruin of a once great state, which, however black its record, is none the less essential to the economic welfare of Europe. The treaty has no economic basis whatsoever to offer for peace. Fortunately, there are signs that our cocksure daily press is not quite so happy about this amazing document as it was. The *Sun* riddles it most effectively. The *World* shows signs of uneasiness, and the *Evening Post*, which at first thought that it was as a "voice from Heaven," retreats sufficiently to say that if there are flaws they can be rectified by the League of Nations. Abroad, the radicals are speaking out splendidly. Thus, in Paris, the *Humanité*, official organ of the Socialist party, speaks of the treaty as "one which no Socialist deputy can ratify, and history will consider it a criminal breach of a sworn word and an outrage on morals and right." This opinion is consonant with that of the London *Herald*, quoted elsewhere in this issue of the *Nation*. The powerful British Labor party has also officially denounced the treaty as a betrayal of democracy.

THE *New York Times's* Berlin correspondent is one of many to assert this week that if the Ebert Government signs the peace treaty it will fall at once. These were the indications when the editor of the *Nation* reached Berlin in March, yet it seemed impossible that the Germans after their moral collapse would have sufficient vigor, vitality, and courage to refuse to sign any treaty. That the Paris Conference would wholly abandon the fourteen peace principles and submit a treaty calling for the practical destruction of Germany was not then foreseen. Now that it is plain to all that part of the world which wishes to see the truth that it is a rank imperialistic peace, there seems to be a pretty general outcry in Germany that it would be better to refuse and face the worst. The alternatives are further starvation, inflicted by the Allied upholders of democracy and morality, and complete isolation, with revolution as well. Against a refusal is operating the pressure of all those capitalists and workers alike who desire peace at any price, and the hungering of all the people, not only after food, but after the normal conditions of life. If in the face of this temptation the Germans are capable of refusing to sign the treaty, they will be credited with much more moral solidarity and force than had seemed credible. But, since the Labor party in England and the radical Socialists in France have denounced the treaty as being utterly unworthy, the Germans may decide to sign and put their hopes in a complete revision of the document whenever these radical British and French forces obtain the powers now held by Clemenceau and Lloyd George.

THAT the Germans will be damned by the Allied press whatever happens is perfectly obvious. If they refuse to sign, it will prove that the republic is no better than the monarchy, that they were not badly enough beaten, that they are not to be trusted, that they are an ungrateful *canaille*. If they sign, and Ebert and Scheidemann are succeeded by Haase and the Independent Socialists, and if the treaty should be repudiated, then it will all have been a contemptible Hun conspiracy from the beginning. The swindle will have been all cooked up in advance, Brockdorff-Rantzau and Ebert and Scheidemann playing their parts as a result of careful pre-arrangement for the express purpose of cheating the Allies of their rewards and their revenge. If the Germans, whether by the hand of Ebert or of Haase, sign promptly, it will show us just what white-livered scoundrels they are. It is so delightfully easy a game to play that we warrant any one of fifty men could write now the editorials which the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Times* will print in any contingency. The only thing that does not happen is the giving of real thought to the terrible condition in which Europe finds herself in relation to Germany, and to the question whether it is after all real statesmanship for the Allies to drive Germany to such extremities. She seems absolutely lost in the event of signing or not signing. But we submit that that is not wisdom nor common sense nor humanity nor diplomatic strategy to put any country, whatever its sins of the past, into such a position. For when the crash comes it will not be Germany alone that will suffer.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE Mannerheim Government in Finland, the recognition of which by Great Britain last week was received with cheers in the Tory House of Commons, has now been recognized by the United States. It is sufficient to say that an act so outrageously inconsistent both with our fair professions and with the inherent justice of the case will almost inevitably strike back into the face of the forces which perpetrated it. Mannerheim led the White Guard against the Red or Soviet forces. To his standard rallied all the upper-Baltic Junkers, all the German-controlled commercial interests of Finland, and all men in Finland who possessed lands and privileges under the old régime. He was frankly and openly a representative of German imperialism. He proposed to set up a monarchy in Finland, and to place one of the sons of the Kaiser on the throne.

THE deeds that Mannerheim did in Finland as leader of the White Guard were not reported in the newspapers. It was not recorded how the White Terror in Finland systematically executed 60,000 officials of labor unions, heads of coöperative enterprises, and Socialist leaders of different grades of radicalism, until a social development of generations in that highly civilized and organized land had been rendered helpless through the selective murder of all its best leadership; how hundreds of thousands of labor unionists, Socialists, and radicals of the rank and file were executed in the same summary fashion; or how, when an election was at last held under the guns of the White Guard, the Socialist vote, in spite of everything, had not declined. But it has been recorded, within the last few months, that General Mannerheim came to London after the armistice had been declared, and was received there by the Foreign Office and by leaders in the House of Commons; while, a little later, attempting to land at Stockholm, he met with such a popular opposition that he decided to turn back; and a little later still, he was stoned by the Danish populace while riding with the King through the streets of Copenhagen. It is the Government of this reactionary general, this imperialistic murderer, that America has now recognized in Finland. The reason for it is not far to seek. The latest news from Helsingfors tells us that an army of 50,000 Finns, supported by Allied troops and material, is to be sent against Petrograd, and that French and British warships are already in the harbor to initiate the enterprise.

THE coming event of a revision of the tariff, in case the Republican party be returned to power at the next election, has cast its shadow before, in the shape of a very pretty disagreement with our nearest neighbor. Interested as the grand old party may be in the cultivation of closer trade relations with Canada, the agricultural interests of our Middle West may not be jeopardized by opening our market to foreign grain and live animals. The reciprocity agreement of 1911 must be superseded by a schedule of concessions in other than agricultural commodities. All this reads very well from the standpoint of the American protectionist—unless his goods happen to appear on the schedule—and the free traders among us, such as are left, may get what diversion they can out of the eternal truth of General Hancock's famous dictum that the tariff is a local issue. But the Canadians are unhappy. It appears that their trade with us in beef, cattle, lambs, and horses, encouraged during the war by abatement of the tariff, has grown to great size, and they are loath to lose it. The Canadian farmers say further, that in the matter of foodstuffs, their preference in the markets of the United Kingdom does not count; that they compete on equal terms with all other sources of agricultural supply; and they think they should not be penalized in the American market on the ground of this supposititious preference which really has no value. Probably the Ottawa Government can be induced to threaten some kind of appropriate retaliation; and both countries seem to be in for a dose of the impressive doctrine that the scarcer commodities can be made, and the higher the price they command, the more prosperous the country will be.

FEDERAL operation of the railways continues to show unfavorable financial results. Director General Hines has recently pointed out that the Government's deficit for the first three months of this year, or the difference between net earnings and one-fourth the guaranteed annual compensation, was about $192,000,000, and that the corresponding loss for the whole of 1918 was $226,000,000. It is only fair to say that Mr. Hines's estimate of the deficit for the first quarter of 1919 greatly exceeds the figure arrived at by the Bureau of Railway Economics, and the Director General explains that his method of figuring gives an unduly unfavorable picture of the financial position. None the less, the loss is a serious one, and it lends point to Mr. Hines's plea that the roads be returned to private ownership at the earliest possible moment. If the shipper and the travelling public had reaped any gains commensurate with the cost, there would be more voices raised in favor of the retention of the roads, but in view of largely increased rates and fares, combined with deteriorated service and financial deficits, it is hard to make out a case for operation by a Government as inefficient as our own. Senator Cummins, in a recent address, truly asserted that transportation is as important a function of government as the maintenance of order. Yet he went on to declare that he advocated private operation of the roads, because it had been demonstrated that the Government could not manage them either economically or efficiently. Our experiment—made under difficult conditions, to be sure—has been a sorry failure thus far. Yet the old feeling against the abuses of private ownership, combined with the newer industrial unrest, has led four thousand striking shop employees in Denver to demand continuance of Government operation, under threat of a general strike of railway employees throughout the whole country. The National Farmers' Council, representing a large number of important farmers' organizations, is also committed to the policy of Government ownership and operation.

IN these days of reactionary tendencies in education, with the German language and the state of Soviet Russia alike taboo, it is encouraging to note that Boston is about to institute a Teachers' Union, under the approval of all five members of the Board of Education. The chairman of the Board, in a statement to the newspapers, expresses his conviction that teachers ought to organize in a union for several good and sufficient reasons—to maintain their self-respect and interest in the profession, to cultivate their moral and economic independence, to be able to demand higher salaries, and to exercise through the union a measure of control over the policies of education. With such an enlightened attitude on the part of the authorities, the movement ought to gain immediate headway.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Poetical Cult of Lincoln

WHEN Secretary Stanton at the bedside of Lincoln declared that the dead man now belonged to the ages, he had a vision which was probably not without melodrama, not without the large pomp and plumage which went in the sixties with the expectation of renown. He must have seen rows of ample bronze statues in innumerable parks, where togaed or equestrian Lincolns would look blandly down, mindful of the dignity of history, upon a reverent people hushed in part by the very weight of the metal which commemorated the great man. It is after all too much to have hoped from Stanton that he could foresee how familiar fame would be with Lincoln, how colloquially it would treat him on the one hand, and on the other how quickly it would make him out not an iron demigod, or a wooden hero, but a friendly saint, an immanent presence, a continual comforter. Richard Henry Stoddard, in his Horatian Ode written almost at the first news, was not even sure that Lincoln was great: he saw in him a curious epitome of the people, a genius who had risen from them, yet safely stood above their variable antipathies and affections. A consciousness of class sounds also in Lowell's more impassioned lines, though the Commemoration Ode identifies the people which had bred Lincoln with the whole American nation, not as divided within itself into grades and ranks, but as united upon a common ground of simple humanity against the ingenuities and insubstantialities of feudal caste. It remained for Whitman to disregard all thought of Lincoln's modest origins and to utter, without argument or doctrine, the intimate grief of the great American poet of the age for the great American leader, the cautious-handed, gentle, plain, just, resolute, the sweetest, wisest soul, the natural captain who had brought in the victor ship from her fearful voyage.

No such classical utterance rendered at the moment, or has rendered since, proper tribute to the aspects of Lincoln which on the whole have most touched the daily memories of his fellow-countrymen: his habit of humor and his habit of pardons. Everywhere in the North, but particularly on his own frontier, he was, even in 1865, reputed for his mirth—for his illuminating repartee and his swift, homely, pertinent apologues. Lincoln stories multiplied, many of them gathered year by year in tolerant volumes which paid no attention to any canon; and still others, often too indelicate for type, clustered about his name through their casual ascription to him by narrators who wanted the effect of his authority. Our folklore is permeated with anecdotes of this description. And side by side with them go other tales of a sentimental sort, tales of wives who went begging to him for the lives of their husbands under military sentence, and of plain, dull, sad old mothers who plead—never in vain by the popular records—for sons who had slept on sentry post almost in the face of the enemy. Of all folk heroes Lincoln most strikingly unites a reputation for wit with a reputation for mercy. The American folk has done nothing more imaginative, and nothing more revealing, than to build up this tender, merry myth.

In the hands of our newest poets, however, the myth is changing both outlines and dimensions. Lincoln's laughter has lost something of its rusticity since we have ceased to live so close to frontier conditions. To Edwin Arlington Robinson, who has cut as in steel his conception of Lincoln the smiling god, the laconic Olympian, that laughter was only a cryptic mirth with which a sage met the rancor of blind gentlemen, sullen children who had to be taught what they could not understand until it should be too late to acknowledge that their master had after all been right and they pitifully wrong. The homespun mantle which Lincoln originally wore in the myth has entirely fallen away, as Mr. Robinson perceives him; and with it have gone both the buffoonery of so much of the popular tradition and the sentimental humanitarianism. What survives is the elemental, ancient matter of heroic genius and wisdom. By this sense of the cosmic elements which shaped his hero, Mr. Robinson stands in the centre of the latest Lincoln cult, a cult which has the distinction of bringing the most revolutionary and most reactionary poets together to pay equal honors to the sole American whom they all agree to honor.

Lowell struck this note tentatively when he spoke of the sweet clay from the West out of which Nature had chosen to fashion the new hero who should be less a lonely mountain-peak than a broad, genial, friendly prairie. Edwin Markham more fully analyzed him: the tried clay of the common road, warmed by the Earth, and dashed through with prophecy and laughter; the color and tang and odor of primal substances, with a dozen virtues caught from external nature. This rhetoric John Gould Fletcher translates into a subtler language in his massive image of Lincoln as a gaunt, scraggly pine which has its roots so deep down in the very foundations of human life, in the old unshakable wisdom and knowledge and goodness and happiness, that wind and weather cannot hurt it and that a nation of men may safely rest in its shade.

The image is finely illustrative of our attitude toward Lincoln during this war, when we constantly turned to him, more by far than most people realized, for words which would quiet our bitter fears and doubts, and for instructions how to act in a time so nearly parallel to his. He was the symbol and seal of our unity; he was our proof that greatness may emerge from the people; he was our evidence that supreme nobility may come very close to our normal love and comprehension. Vachel Lindsay, in Lincoln's own Springfield, gave true voice to this feeling in the poem which speaks of Lincoln as so stirred even in death by the horrors which alarmed the universe that he could not sleep, but walked up and down through the midnight streets, mourning and brooding over the violent dangers as in the days when he himself bore the burden of a similar, however smaller, strife. It is precisely thus, in less critical ages, that saints are said to appear at difficult moments, to quiet the waves or turn the arrow aside. These more vulgar manifestations Mr. Lindsay naturally did not use. Lincoln as he walks at midnight is only the desire of our hearts realized, the apparition for a moment in its bodily vesture of a spirit too precious ever to have became merely a memory. He lives as the father of every cult lives, in the echoes of his voice on many tongues and the vibrations of his presence in many hearts. For poetry such a cult offers an enormous future as yet only just suspected. Our poets have a folk-hero who to the common folk-virtues of shrewdness and kindness adds essential wit and eloquence and loftiness of soul. Perhaps the disposition just now to purge him of all rankness and to make him out a saint and mystic may not last forever, but obviously it is a step in his poetical history analogous to those steps which ennobled Charlemagne and Arthur, and canonized Joan of Arc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Madness at Versailles

IT was not to be hoped that there would be a generous peace. The wickednesses of the German armies were too obvious, the bad faith of the German Imperial Government had been too clearly demonstrated to admit of any settlement which did not impose heavy penalties and exact specific and ample guarantees. The temper of the victorious Allies as a whole was too harsh, and that of the French in particular too strained with nervous dread, to make possible a peace under which Germany would have much power to recuperate rapidly. Moreover, official reports and unofficial intimations from Paris, although dealing for the most part with scattered details rather than with larger or connected topics, have been sufficient to indicate that the Peace Conference was little disposed to make concessions, and increasingly inclined to be drastic. For a rigorous peace, in short, the world was already somewhat prepared. But it was not prepared for a peace of undisguised vengeance, for a peace which openly flouts some of the plainest dictates of reason and humanity, repudiates every generous word that Mr. Wilson has ever uttered regarding Germany, flies in the face of accepted principles of law and economics, and makes the very name of democracy a reproach. In the whole history of diplomacy there is no treaty more properly to be regarded as an international crime than the amazing document which the German representatives are now asked to sign.

Only as one keeps in mind the high professions with which the war was conducted—professions of which Mr. Wilson, more than any one else, was the polished and unctuous mouthpiece, and which the Allies by their applause impliedly accepted—is the enormity of what has happened to be fully comprehended. The world was to be made safe for democracy. German militarism was to be crushed, and the German Constitution itself was to be so changed as to emancipate the German people from autocratic rule and make impossible the repetition of such a war as this one had proved itself to be. The German people, who, it was repeatedly affirmed, had had no part in bringing on the war, and who at the worst were the helpless instruments of its prosecution, were to be freed from tyranny and given a chance to take their place among the peoples who love liberty and practice righteousness. Again and again, in the rhetorical documents in which Mr. Wilson expounded to a waiting world the divine order of human society, he declared that America, at least, had no quarrel with the German people, that it begrudged them no greatness which their industry and intelligence might attain, and that a victorious peace, if it meant punitive damages or harsh restraint, would be worse than useless as a world settlement. And for the attainment of these ends and their sanctification a League of Nations was to be set up, with Germany itself, if it would cease to do evil and learn to do well, as one of its members.

How have these generous professions, honorable alike to those who made them and to those who trusted them, been carried out? The treaty affords only one answer. Germany and the German people are virtually to be destroyed. The burdens which the treaty imposes are heavier than any people can bear and progress. To begin with, German territory is to be diminished. Including Alsace-Lorraine, Silesia, Posen, the Saar Basin, and other areas, Germany is to lose 35,175 square miles, in addition to 8,572 square miles in Schleswig and East Prussia which will presumably have to be parted with in consequence of referendum votes on the question of allegiance for which the treaty provides. Even conceding that the whole of Alsace-Lorraine ought to be restored to France, and that the inhabitants of the designated portions of Schleswig and East Prussia should be allowed to determine their allegiance, the loss of territory still aggregates 29,575 square miles. In addition to deprivation of territory in Europe, Germany is to renounce in favor of the Allies and the other so-called associated Powers all its overseas possessions, including not only its colonies but its rights and property in China, Siam, Liberia, Morocco, Egypt, Turkey, and Bulgaria. The destruction of Germany's military and naval power is virtually complete; its army is reduced to 100,000 men, its navy is cut down to a handful of vessels, conscription is abolished, the further construction of wireless stations is forbidden, and most of its cables are appropriated by the victors. Within a zone of fifty kilometres east of the Rhine all fortifications are to be destroyed.

All this, drastic as it is, forms only the opening chapter. There are to be reparations, indemnities, and strangling economic punishments as well. What the aggregate amount of indemnities and reparations is to be has not, apparently, yet been determined, but, whatever it is, Germany is to go on paying it for thirty years, beginning with an initial payment within two years of a billion pounds sterling. At the same time it is required to devote its economic resources directly to the restoration of the invaded regions of Belgium and France; to deliver annually for ten years to those countries and to Italy great quantities of coal (one of its principal coal fields, the Saar Basin, having in the meantime been surrendered); and to grant to the Allied and associated Powers preferences and concessions in trade which will go far toward destroying German competition in any branch of industry. As if deliberately to add insult to penalty, the victors further propose to exact from Germany most-favored-nation treatment for their own vessels in the German fishing and coasting trade, and even in towage; while as a guarantee that the requirements of the treaty will be met, German territory west of the Rhine, together with the bridgeheads on that river, is to be occupied by Allied and associated troops for fifteen years, unless in the meantime the requirements of the treaty are fully complied with.

Nor is this all. The provisions for the disarmament of Germany, which might easily, had the victorious Powers so chosen, have been made a beneficent illustration of how a great state might live in peace and happiness without an army or a navy greater than the needs for a police, are wholly negatived, so far as moral value is concerned, by the failure of the treaty to provide for any measure whatever of disarmament on the part of the Allies and their associates. As the treaty stands, Germany is to be stripped of its means of defence as well as of offence, while its conquerors hover about it fully armed. If there were still need of proof that the League of Nations, as a device for insuring world peace, is only an alliance of three great Powers to enforce their will upon all the others, the treatment accorded to Germany at this point should furnish the demonstration. Further, what is to be said for a treaty which requires Germany to "hand over to the associated Governments, either jointly or severally, all persons" accused of "having committed acts in violation of the laws

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and customs of war," together with "all documents and information necessary to insure full knowledge of the incriminating acts, the discovery of the offenders, and the just appreciation of the responsibility," one of the alleged offenders being the former Kaiser, now outside of German territory; to concede in advance the validity of treaties yet to be made with Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, including the decisions which may be made regarding their territory; to recognize in advance any new states that may be formed out of the territory of the three Powers mentioned, with such boundaries as may be agreed upon; to accept in advance the decisions of prize courts of the Allies regarding ships or goods; and to admit the jurisdiction of a League of Nations of which it is not a member, and which it cannot enter save with the unanimous consent of the Powers which are seeking its destruction?

Such are the terms to which the representatives of Germany are asked to set their hands without demur. Such is the treaty which is to end a war fought to overthrow autocracy and militarism and to enthrone democracy and peace. Such is the settlement to which the President of the United States has given his approval, and which the Senate of the United States will be asked to ratify. The heinousness of its offending, the calculating harshness of its demands and impositions, the gross repudiation of moral obligations and good faith which it involves, its gross injustice to the Allied peoples themselves and to their moral standing, become only the more apparent as its terms are studied. It is a peace of vengeance, not of justice. It will not restore Germany to the family of nations; it will destroy Germany as a Great Power. What will be the fate of Germany if the treaty prevails is, however, quite the least important aspect of the matter; the great and startling question now is what will be the fate of democracy, of political and economic liberty, of morals and ideals? How stands it with the peoples at this grave moment in the world's career?

It would be idle now to mince words. The meaning of the treaty is obvious. After nearly five years of strenuous effort and high expectancy, the hopes of the peoples have been destroyed. The progress of democracy as either a theory or a practice of social righteousness has been suddenly and forcibly checked. The great reforms which were to substitute the rule of peoples for the rule of Governments, abolish war as a means of aggression or of settling international disputes, break down alliances and balances of power, put secret diplomacy under the ban, do away with discriminating tariffs, establish the right of self-government for all peoples who desired it and were fit to exercise it, and bind the nations in a world league in which all would enjoy equal rights and equal opportunity, have been checked in their progress. In place of these helpful things of which patriots had dreamed, and which the peoples of the world for one brief moment imagined they were about to grasp, there has been enthroned at Versailles an arrogant and self-sufficient autocracy of five Great Powers, two of which are practically at the mercy of the other three; an autocracy owning no authority save its own will, deliberating in secret, parcelling out privileges and territory as best serves its own interests, turning a deaf ear to protests and closing its eyes to facts, observing no sounder principles than those of political compromise, and ordering all things by its own self-centred notions of how the peoples may best be controlled. It is this Versailles autocracy which, in crushing Germany as a world Power, has itself assumed the rôle of world dictator. That it is vindictive as well as powerful, that its resources are immense, and that it intends to have its way with the peoples and their aspirations, no one now need cherish any doubt whatever. Progress henceforth is to go by favor, and the favor will be that of the Big Three.

History, perhaps, will some time tell us how, among the men who have dominated the proceedings at Versailles, the responsibility for this state of things should be apportioned. None, surely, who have had a hand in the determinations of the Peace Conference can go unblamed, save as they may have been overborne by the weight of authority. Yet the verdict of history will not, we think, be incorrectly forecast if the larger blame for the check which liberty and democracy have received is laid to the charge of Woodrow Wilson. To Mr. Wilson, more than to any other man who has ever lived, it fell to voice the aspirations of the world's peoples and to receive their homage. The times and the opportunity were alike supremely great. The stream of revolt against privilege and privilege-begotten wealth, the demand for the abolition of autocracy and the substitution of a political and economic régime in which the people should rule in fact as well as in name, had risen to the point where all that was needed, apparently, was wise and inspiring direction to make it an instrument of the greatest gains for human welfare that the race had ever known. It was Mr. Wilson's achievement to give to this great yearning of the world's masses, not indeed constructive leadership, for he has builded nothing that will endure, but a winning exposition and a moral unction which caught the imagination of peoples everywhere, riveted their attention upon him as the one man living who sounded their motives and voiced their aspirations, and made him their idol as well as their guide and friend. The trust which the peoples gave him, the appeals which they fondly directed to him, and the high expectations with which they hung upon his words, were as pathetic in simplicity as they were imposing in weight and mass. He was the hope of democracy, and the fear of his enemies was the confidence of his friends.

How Mr. Wilson has repaid the confidence which the peoples gave him, all the world now knows. The one-time idol of democracy stands today discredited and condemned. His rhetorical phrases, torn and faded tinsel of a thought which men now doubt if he himself ever really believed, will never again fall with hypnotic charm upon the ears of eager multitudes. The camouflage of ethical precept and political philosophizing which for long blinded the eyes of all but the most observing has been stripped away, and the peoples of the world see revealed, not a friend faithful to the last, but an arrogant autocrat and a compromising politician. And with the loss of the robes which gave him sanctity goes also the loss of all liberal and ennobling support. There will still be many to applaud the treaty, and to join hands with Mr. Wilson in remorseless effort to push vengeance to completion, but they will not be the liberals who long acclaimed him as their leader nor the masses who once saw in him a second Providence. Those who stand with him now—strange transformation when one recalls the years of his ascendancy—are the staunch supporters of power and privilege, the controllers of great wealth and dictators of social favor, the voluble champions of the established order against every form of revolution, the preachers of hate and prejudice, and the timid and depend-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent whose souls are not their own. These are the ones who now do Mr. Wilson honor.

It is well that the line should at last be clearly drawn, for with the publication of the German treaty the real battle for liberty begins. All that has gone before—the overthrow of Czardom in Russia, the constitutional struggle in Germany, the establishment of a Soviet Government in Hungary, the revolt against tyranny or constraint in all quarters of the globe—are only the preliminaries of the great revolution to whose support the friends of freedom must now rally everywhere. Less and less, as that struggle widens, will the world have place for either liberals or conservatives: Versailles has forced men into two main camps, the radicals and the reactionaries. Heaven grant that the revolution may be peaceful, and that it may destroy only to rebuild! Whatever its course, it is the peoples who have been deluded and ignored who will play the leading part, for with the appalling example of Mr. Wilson and the Peace Conference before their eyes, the peoples will have small use for any leadership save their own. This is the scene which the moral collapse at Versailles opens to the world, this the promised land toward which the peoples of the world will now press with all their strength. With Germany crushed and autocracy enthroned, with the strong hand of power at the throat of liberty, the battle opens which is to make men free.

A Secretary of Education

THE reconstruction programme of the Republicans in the next Congress will include a plan for a Department of Education under a Secretary who will be a member of the Cabinet. A bill approved by the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the American Federation of Labor, is to be introduced by Representative Towner of Iowa, who is slated to be chairman of the House Committee on Education. This measure, substantially the same as the one urged during the last Congress, aims to coördinate the work of the eighty-odd Federal bureaus and boards among which educational administration is now scattered, and to meet some of the needs called to popular attention during the war, though known to educational students long before its outbreak. The proposed bill authorizes an annual appropriation of $100,000,000, to be distributed as follows: removal of illiteracy, $7,500,000; Americanization, $7,500,000; equalization of educational opportunities, including partial payment of teachers' salaries and extension of school terms, $50,000,000; physical education, including health and sanitation, $20,000,000; and preparation of teachers, $15,000,000. The fund is to be shared with the States under plans similar to those employed in road-building and farm-extension work in the Department of Agriculture—that is to say, Federal appropriations will be contingent on corresponding State grants, and the administration and control of education will remain in the hands of State and local authorities.

The improvement of our national education is a purpose which will of course command the instant assent of all intelligent persons, and there is no doubt of the need. The disclosure by the Draft Act of the presence in the United States of 700,000 illiterate men between twenty-one and thirty-one years of age came as a shock to most persons who had not studied the situation. Americanization of course has become, during the past five years, a word to conjure with. The wretched physical equipment of schools, especially in isolated rural districts, and the inadequate pay of teachers, have long been matters of common knowledge. In physical education, as is well known, we have done next to nothing, while Sweden, for example, has for a century enjoyed the benefits of a system that has made the Swedes probably the best developed people physically in the world. As for the training of teachers, there are tens of thousands of them today who could not pass examinations for entrance to a respectable high school. Nothing is better calculated to dispel the characteristic American complaisance regarding "our great system of free public education" than an honest examination of its actual details and results.

To state the need, however, is by no means to approve every suggested means of meeting it. We do indeed favor the use of the Federal taxing power for the purpose of improving educational facilities in backward communities throughout the country; but we realize that something more than the increase of per capita appropriations is needed for such improvement, as our experience shows. We have multiplied schools, but have not yet educated ourselves. We have learned how to make a living, but have not yet learned how to live. The war has shown us how many among us do not know how to read; but, what is much more serious, it has also shown us how many do not know how to think. It has set us to demanding literacy and "Americanization"; unfortunately it has not set us to demanding power of reflection, independent judgment, and moral self-discipline—the qualities that mean life, as opposed to mere living. It is these qualities at which education must aim, and they are not to be developed simply by machinery and administration.

If the proposed plan is to serve genuine educational ends, therefore, we must have clear answers to certain questions. Is it designed to increase or diminish the power of the "administrators" who already overload our schools, from kindergarten to university, by comparison with the power of the teachers who teach? Four-fifths of the so-called "Americanization" work now carried on is an ignorant and narrow attempt to force our immigrants into the straitjacket of a provincial, materialistic, and inurbane "American" life. Is it for such work that we are to spend seven and a half millions, or is it for the mutual enrichment of their life and ours, and for the sturdy maintenance of the older American ideals that many have been so ready to forget during the war? Is physical education intended to make of the people good working cattle, or is it designed to develop the sound body that shall be the instrument of the sane, keen mind, serving the serene and honest spirit? In "equalizing opportunities," is it planned simply to have better buildings and to "raise the standard" of teachers by requiring a longer period of preparation? In a word, is the proposed Department of Education to be machinery, or is it to be embodied spirit? Is it planned to make our children think more or less alike? Is it intended to produce standardized citizens, guaranteed to think right when Washington pushes the button, or is it designed to train thoughtful, independent, kindly men and women, richly endowed in mind and spirit? That is the central question; it cannot be too carefully pondered, and the probable working of the proposed plan cannot be too narrowly examined with reference to its effect in this direction. For man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Passing of Sherry's

THE passing of Sherry's and Delmonico's announced in one week—how shall New York live on without them? The reasons are no secret. The twin evils of prohibition and Bolshevism, Mr. Sherry says—prohibition, of course, among his guests and Bolshevism among his waiters—have put an end to what has been a truly great institution. If the waiters ever drank champagne it was the lees in the cup. If they became drunk on cheaper wines, discharge was the penalty; the patrons who drank too much champagne were, at least, "good spenders." But now, it appears, this dread spirit of Bolshevism has found its way into the ranks of the waiters. The Russian taint is upon them; they will be content neither with enormous tips nor with the wages Mr. Sherry has decreed. They have unions and opinions all their own. Hence his business goes down—far down—to the Waldorf-Astoria; Mr. Sherry becomes a manufacturer of candies; and a trust company takes over the palace in which have been given such marvellous, such Lucullian, such historic entertainments. No longer shall we read of dinners on horseback in the second story, of entertainments there for princes and by princes, of feasts with Caruso and Farrar to sing for a king's ransom, or hear rumors of banquets à la Seely to which reporters and police captains were not invited.

And Delmonico's, too, across the street? Well, here there seems to be a faint hope. Bolshevism, it appears, has not yet crossed the avenue from west to east, but prohibition threatens. A group of old patrons assembled last week to hear all the sad details of the receivership in which "Del's" has languished for some months. These patrons, too, have plainly suffered from income taxes and excess profits levies, contributions to war charities, and Liberty Loans. Their pockets must be inside out, for when it came to passing the hat for a guarantee fund to keep the doors open and the tables covered there was only a beggarly $200,000 subscribed in fifteen minutes or so. No wonder that the receiver still plans to move to Park Avenue or to transform the bulk of the building into stores and bachelor apartments while keeping a small restaurant going. It should have been $800,000, not $200,000.

New York always was careless about its civic monuments, its most refining institutions, all the things that make for the nobler side of life. How can it let Delmonico's pass? It was here, all the world believes, that Charley Murphy, boss of Tammany Hall, was first taught to eat peas with a fork. And here this master of all Manhattan has made and unmade judges, mayors, governors, and senators, and fixed their campaign contributions. Here the politicians have opened up "wine" to wet the way to preferment. Here the Wall Street magnates of the old sporting type have held forth and here the *nouveaux riches* from Keokuk and Kalamazoo have ventured in awe and trembling, after graduating from the Waldorf's Peacock Alley, to gaze upon the real wickedness and riotousness of New York life. Who shall measure the cultural values and uses of a Delmonico and a Sherry? Who can fail to see that when it comes to tracing the rise of civilizing forces in Iowa and Nebraska it will be to such institutions as these that monuments will be decreed? When Oklahoma, for instance, erects its obelisk to carry the story of its civilization to a future race, it will place among the most sacred of its hieroglyphics the lobster of Sherry and the mock turtle of Delmonico, alongside the scarab of Ptolemy Wilson and the sacred ibis of Paris. One searches the world over for the counterpart of "Del's." Prohibition —yes, its crimes are many. What worse could we lay at its door than the closing of such institutions of learning?

IT is pleasant to record fresh recognition on the part of a church body of the needs of the hour. The Federal Council of Churches in America, at its special meeting held in Cleveland last week, came out for industrial and social reform, which only a few years ago would have been deemed beyond the scope and purpose of any church gathering. After voting, of course, that it stood for "orderly and progressive social reconstruction instead of revolution by violence," the Council went on to say that it sympathized with labor's desire "for an equitable share in the profits and management of industry." To the Council an "ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy," and joint shop-control and management are "inevitable steps in its attainment." The Council is also ready for the eight-hour day, a minimum wage, social insurance, equal pay for women where there is equal work, full political equality for women, and the abolition of child labor. On the international side the Council favors a League of Nations, equality of race treatment, and the adoption of a new Oriental policy for the United States, so as to bring our policy in line with our preachments. It is a fine, liberal programme, but best of all it shows that after the madness of war the church is beginning to see that it must act speedily if it is not to be included among the wreckage of the struggle.

ON May Day a peaceful meeting at the new building of the New York *Call*, the leading Socialist newspaper of America, was raided by soldiers and sailors in uniform. The meeting was nothing more than a housewarming to celebrate the acquisition of the new building, and was attended by the editors and directors of the *Call*, with their families and friends. The police did not put in an appearance, and the raid developed into a disgraceful breach of law and order, during which women and children were beaten with clubs. Undisputed evidence exists that this raid was instigated by certain officials of the Victory Loan. The editor of the *Call*, in addition to lodging the proper protests with the local authorities, submitted the evidence incriminating the Victory Loan officials to Secretary of the Treasury Carter A. Glass. Mr. Glass replied in a long telegram, stating the channels through which he had made investigation of the case, and closing with these words: "I am not prepared to say that the ultimate responsibility for the disorders to which you call attention rests with the soldiers and sailors, rather than with those incendiary publications which they resented." That is all—and apparently nothing is to be done about it. The Secretary of the Treasury, after investigation, does not attempt to refute the evidence. He tacitly admits that officials of the Victory Loan were involved in the raid, since that was the accusation. He condones the open breach of law and order, and throws the blame upon "those incendiary publications which they (the soldiers and sailors) resented." We do not understand the processes of Mr. Glass's thought. Does he feel that there is one law for members of the old parties and another law for the Socialists? It is no light thing to have a Secretary of the Treasury failing to condemn lawlessness and violence.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Wilson was Defeated at Paris

By LINCOLN COLCORD

THE progress of events is now rapidly showing us how far astray from sense and reason we have wandered during the world war, and how little we actually have learned. Things are being told us today which, although they were sufficiently known at the time of their happening, could not have been spoken of publicly under all the bans and penalties of an autocratic bureaucracy and a docile public opinion; and their publication now causes hardly a ripple of interest. We are at last permitted to read, for instance, from the pen of no less a patriot than Mrs. Humphry Ward, the full story of the great French mutiny of 1917, when regiments of French soldiers before Verdun shot their officers and started to go home. We are permitted to read, from the pen of one of the ablest American correspondents in Paris, the story of how Clemenceau in 1918 threatened to make a separate peace with Germany unless the command were unified and Foch were appointed generalissimo of all the Allied and American forces. In fact, the press for several months has been full and running over with the "cold" political news of the past few years—news which once might have precipitated revolutions, but which falls today without comment, and apparently without public comprehension of its significance.

There was a sense in which the American public throughout the war knew less than nothing of the true state of European politics and society; for to know a mask is less than to know the man. Perhaps we had scant groundwork for a perspicacious knowledge either in interest or in education. Perhaps we were determined to idealize the war. The cue for idealism had been given from Washington; or, to bring the figure down to the terms of modern dramatics, we had been told to "register" idealism. But the war nevertheless took our hearts far afield, and opened our eyes wider in the direction of Europe than they had for a long time been opened toward foreign lands. Yet the net result of our mal-education under the tutelage of an irrational censor and the direction of a narrow Bourbonism was the creation of an ignorance so vast and an emotionalism so overwhelming as well-nigh to defeat the original purpose and integrity of the enterprise. In short, we almost wholly lost our point of view; and when we had helped to win the war for idealism, we were unable to perceive that idealism quite unaccountably had been somewhere left in the lurch. Even today we are looking squint-eyed at Paris, failing to recognize truth and falsehood when we see them.

But if the American public has remained in ignorance of the real trend and significance of affairs abroad, what of our Government, what of that bureaucracy which has elected to keep the people in ignorance? Has the Administration actually been better informed? To the man in the street, the question sounds absurd. He thinks at once of the impressive name of the State Department, of the sacred mysteries of government; and all his conceptions of public men and affairs are unconsciously exaggerated by the medium through which he knows of them—by the constant repetition of names in the newspapers, and by the artificial value which publicity gives to all events. He has a perfectly wholesome feeling that the Government *must* know the facts. To those who have had a glimpse behind the curtain, however, and especially to the Washington newspaper correspondent, there remains neither mystery nor illusion. He beholds the Government as a piece of unbelievably inefficient machinery, and the Administration as a group of very ordinary men. He learns to accept incredible facts, and to attribute ordinary failings to these men. In short, he learns the simple truth, without glamor or evasion.

From such a post of vantage (and of despair), I have often wondered, during the past two years, what the effect would be upon public opinion if a majority, or even an influential minority, of the American people could realize the actual conditions under which the foreign policies of the country were determined. What would happen, for instance, if they could credit, know, and understand that the Government probably was more ignorant of politics and affairs abroad than many a private individual or organization; that the State Department was organized virtually to withhold true information, in the sense that it was committed to a presentation only of the acceptable bureaucratic point of view; that the claim of "secret and confidential information" in which every official, from the President down, took refuge when hard pressed, was frequently nothing but specious humbug; that while baskets-full of secret and confidential information unquestionably poured in upon the State Department, practically none of it bore on the more vital forces and issues that were moving in the world; that a great deal of authentic information from abroad was not permitted to enter the doors of the State Department at all; that the small residue of true report which found lodgment there was, in the nature of the bureaucratic atmosphere, self-discredited and rarely considered; and that the whole effort of the Administration to maintain an authority over opinion and to keep the public in ignorance of true facts was largely inspired, either deliberately or unconsciously, by the desire of the bureaucracy to cover up its inadequacy and inefficiency, and to have its own way without the bother of a formidable opposition.

These are serious allegations; but to any candid mind the general proof of them is written plain on the face of daily affairs. We went into the war, on the argument of the President, to fight for ideals and for a democratic peace. We have helped materially to win the war. Neither ideals nor a democratic peace have been the resultant. On the promise of the President, we did not go into the war to fight for the secret treaties of the Allies or for any imperialistic aims. All of the secret treaties and many imperialistic aims are written into the peace which we have helped to win and are prepared to sign. These secret treaties were in existence when we entered the war. We were fighting for them all along, it seems. If the President knew of them, it was his duty to insist upon their abrogation. No less a demand could have squared his acts with his professions. If he did not know of them, it was his duty to find out about them. No sane man would lead a country into a blind fight. As a matter of fact, he did know of them, in the sense that all the world knew of them; yet he did not permit himself to know of them officially, he would not consider them seriously, he persisted in the belief that he would be able single-handed to offset them at the Peace Conference. It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should have been obvious, however, that if these secret treaties were not revised at some time prior to the Conference, they would be written into the peace treaty; and that to carry America forward in the war on the issues of democracy and idealism while the treaties remained in existence was an act devoid of both wisdom and sincerity.

A few weeks ago, on the front page of one of our most important newspapers, we read how President Wilson in Paris learned for the first time in Paris of the secret treaties between Japan and the Entente Allies. The dispatch runs:

> It was an awkward moment. Mr. Lloyd George turned to Baron Makino, whereupon Mr. Wilson was informed that Japan had received the promise of England, France, Italy, and Russia, two years before, that she should have outright all the German islands north of the equator, and that she had agreed that Australia should have all to the south. It was common knowledge that such a distribution had long been contemplated, but nobody outside the Foreign Offices of the Governments directly involved knew that there were definite, signed agreements concerning the deal.
>
> After learning so much, Mr. Wilson asked if there were any other secret agreements which had not been produced at the Conference. It was then admitted that the agreement with Japan also included the British, French, and Italian promises to support her claims to the Chinese Province of Shantung as the price Japan demanded for allowing China to enter the war, despite the fact that China had repeatedly been trying to get into the war against Germany of her own volition.

The dispatch goes on to give the texts of these treaties, entered into by Great Britain under date of February 16, 1917, and by France on March 1, 1917. Why did not Mr. Wilson know of these treaties long before? Why was his diplomatic conduct not such as to require their production before we had helped to drive the war through to victory? This is no captious criticism. Thousands of American boys have died in the war—not, we had understood, for the maintenance of secret treaties known only in the Foreign Offices of the Government directly involved. Yet these secret treaties are what we have won. The Allies gauged the President accurately. "It was an awkward moment"—but he finally supported them. No wonder George Lansbury, one of the firmest friends of President Wilson's fourteen points, says in the London daily *Herald*, commenting on the peace treaty:

> There is no honor left for any of us. The League of Nations is a body without soul. President Wilson has been beaten. He forced public acceptance of his ideals on the other powers, but they have beaten him secretly. He compromised on essentials, and, therefore, the details have gone astray. From the moment he abandoned the first of the Fourteen Points, he abandoned them all.

Indeed, it was far too late at the Peace Conference for President Wilson to kick over the traces and demand a revision of the Allied imperialistic war aims. He should have done it at the beginning of our participation in the war. But throughout the spring and summer of 1917 the President, as all his friends admitted, was so deeply immersed in academic projects for the prosecution of the war that he forgot his primary function as director of the country's foreign policies. Unfortunately, it was an important summer, perhaps the critical summer of the war—the summer of the first Russian Revolution, of the Stockholm Conference, and of the Reichstag Resolutions. To these vital manifestations, with all that they entailed, the President gave only a perfunctory consideration; he was busy at home with the war. The Allied Missions, too, were visiting us that summer. Mr. Balfour came first, and was a powerful influence upon the President's policies. Then came Maréchal Joffre and M. Viviani; then the Italians. The country sentimentalized the visitors, and, through them, the war. The President liked it; it helped him to evade problems and escape the results of inefficiency in his Administration. He encouraged the sentiment. Plainly, it was no time, from his point of view, to be talking of the Allied imperialistic war aims or to be demanding the revision of secret treaties. Yet the processes of time, truth, and history are inexorable. It happened to be the only time when the desired result could have been accomplished. Failing that opportunity, it was written into the future that the fruits of the first Russian Revolution would be lost, and that the secret treaties of the Allies would be maintained at the Peace Conference when it came. Thereafter, America was committed to support of, and actually was fighting for, the imperialistic aims (not for herself, but for the Allies), to which she has now set her hand.

Did President Wilson, in the summer of 1917, know about the secret treaties of the Allies? Beyond question, he did. When Mr. Balfour was in America in the early part of that summer, Colonel House requested him, on the score that we were now in the war, and that President Wilson ought to see what we were fighting for, to send copies of all the secret treaties to Washington on his return to England. Mr. Balfour gladly consented. I heard this statement in September, *from Colonel House himself*. At that date, Mr. Balfour had submitted no treaties to Washington, and no further request for them had been made at the British Foreign Office.

These treaties, of course, were published by Trotzky in Petrograd in November of 1917. At that time, I have been informed on the best of authority, the State Department cabled Ambassador Francis to send the texts of the treaties immediately by cable to Washington. Ambassador Francis replied by sending a summary of the treaties, saying the texts themselves were too long to trust to the inadequate cable service from Russia, and that he was sending them by courier. Presumably, then, it was some six weeks after the publication of the secret treaties in Petrograd before President Wilson saw them for the first time, except for the news reports from Russia and the summary from Ambassador Francis. There is no evidence in the course of events that he took due cognizance of them even at this time. He made no effort to effect their revision. With the indubitable knowledge of their existence and terms, he outlined, a month later, his famous Fourteen Points, and continued to draw for America the vision which, in the nature of the facts with which he was then dealing, could not have been attained. It is only fair to assume that he himself was deluded; at all times he promised himself that he would rectify the error when the Peace Conference came. But history is very hard on such practices; and since men have died and empires have been lost and infinite wrong has been done in pursuit of the illusion, it is difficult to forgive him his peculiar and rather deliberate sin. None are so blind as those who will not see. The Peace Conference came—and the original error triumphed. The cold fact is that our splendid idealism has been perverted to ignoble and disastrous ends.

It would be easy to multiply against the Administration and the State Department instances of failure to collect or to recognize true facts. The process of collecting true facts and acting upon them is wholly foreign to the bureaucratic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

atmosphere of the present régime. Instead, the method is reversed; a policy is predetermined on the basis of academic theory, and the machinery of the diplomatic service is utilized to collect and forward the facts which will support this predetermined policy, and to eliminate the facts which will oppose it. The President's note of February, 1918, to Japan, was never given to the American people. It flatly opposed Japanese intervention in Siberia, and stated the argument in such a comprehensive fashion that it would have pinned him down to a policy of non-intervention if the people had known of it. It was written without knowledge of the Japanese political situation, without a request having been sent by the State Department to the Embassy in Tokio for a report on that situation, or without any such report having been submitted by the Embassy in Tokio to the State Department. In other words, it was fired off in the air; and not until several weeks later did the information reach Washington through the press that there was a substantial political opposition in Japan to intervention in Siberia. It is safe to say that no adequate knowledge or information exists today in the State Department of the political situation in Japan.

On February 20-23, 1918, the Inter-Allied Labor Conference was held in London. American labor delegates did not attend. The Conference delegated Camille Huysmans and others to go to America and attempt to bring our labor movement into a more liberal frame of mind. The whole issue of President Wilson's liberalism was involved. The delegates at London were the true friends of his fourteen principles, the true enemies of the secret treaties. Two weeks after that event, the Administration had no knowledge of the Inter-Allied Labor Conference. It did not know that Camille Huysmans proposed coming to America. Such events were wholly out of the State Department's sphere. The press news of the Conference, of course, was almost entirely cut off by the British censor; but the information finally reached the Administration through unofficial channels. To judge by the results, it must have thrown the Administration into quite a panic. Huysmans and the Inter-Allied Labor Conference stood for a conference with German delegates. The British Government was asked to stop these men from coming. A hand-picked group of Lloyd George adherents in British labor circles was immediately dispatched to America. The Gompers mission was immediately dispatched from America to England—at the expense, it is reported, of the British Government—in an effort to split the British Labor Party. It was not until a month after the close of the Inter-Allied Labor Conference of February that the first labor report of the war was received by the State Department from the American Embassy in London. Thus closely was President Wilson cognizant of and working with his real friends; and thus deliberately did he sustain the hands of his real enemies.

Space does not permit an analysis of the failure of the State Department with respect to the Russian situation; the blame in that quarter, also, lies primarily with the President. This is a story which will receive later treatment; suffice it to say that it is the most terrible and colossal failure of our diplomacy in the war. Because of it, the world is faced with untold misery. Russia is still the key to the whole settlement of the war; and a reversal of our vicious Russian policy, and a return to "open covenants of peace *openly arrived at*," might yet solve the tragic difficulties of the world.

England in Revolution

By RICHARD ROBERTS

DURING the last two or three years a succession of notable documents has appeared in England, the more obviously important ones being the British Labor Party Programme, the Whitley Report, the Ministry of Reconstruction Reports on Juvenile Employment, on Labor Conditions and Adult Education, and on the Machinery of Government, and the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems. While the immediate significance of these documents is very great, it is likely that their historical importance will be even greater; for they will be taken as illustrating the method by which England carried through her social revolution.

It is possible, however, that another document, which comes as a sort of climax, will possess even greater significance than any of these. This is the Report of the recent National Industrial Conference which was called by the Government in order to consider the critical industrial situation at the beginning of the present year. This situation, created by a number of causes, was aggravated beyond the point of toleration by the dilatoriness of the Government in coming to grips with the questions involved, especially in the face of the profusion of its promises at the general election. The crisis came to a head when the "Triple Alliance"—the three great unions of miners, railwaymen, and transport workers—threatened a general strike if the Government did not take immediate steps to meet the demands of organized labor. The Government answered this ultimatum by calling a national conference, composed of eight hundred members, representing the employers' and the workers' interests equally, to go into the whole industrial situation and to report upon it immediately. The conference held its first meeting on February 27 and appointed a joint committee, again composed of equal numbers of representatives of employers and workers, "to consider and report . . . on the causes of the present unrest and the steps necessary to safeguard and promote the best interests of employers, work-people, and the state." The joint committee was specially enjoined to inquire into questions relative to hours, wages, general conditions of employment, unemployment and its prevention, and the best methods of promoting coöperation between capital and labor. This committee reported to the reassembled conference on April 4. Its report was unanimously adopted; and it is almost certain that its provisions will receive speedy legislative endorsement.

It is probably not too much to say that this report, if the Government acts upon it, will prevent any extreme or general measures of "direct action" on the part of organized labor in Great Britain. It does not indeed concede all that labor demanded: but the fact that the joint committee produced a unanimous report and that the conference accepted it unanimously shows the existence of a spirit of reasonableness and good-will on both sides which holds the promise that England will, as Karl Marx said she would, accomplish her social revolution without violence. Evidence of the same spirit is to be found in the miners' acceptance of the Sankey Report, which gave them a good deal less than they asked for, but was nevertheless a very substantial advance in the direction in which their faces are turned. It has to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

added that the employers have shown a no less conciliatory temper, much more than had been anticipated; and the present solution is a triumph of good sense and good-will.

The report is in two main parts. The first deals with the specific measures which are immediately called for to allay existing unrest; the second has to do with the important proposal for a permanent National Industrial Council. Appended to the report is a memorandum, signed by Messrs. Arthur Henderson and G. D. H. Cole, representing the view of the trade-union members of the joint committee upon the causes of labor unrest and the remedies for it. This memorandum is a long document, but in the main it travels through familiar territory. Its chief significance lies in its clear declaration that the major cause of labor unrest is the determination of labor "to challenge the whole existing structure of capitalist industry," and to demand the substitution of the motive of public service for that of private gain. Much as this report concedes to labor, it is evident that labor itself regards it only as a stage towards the goal of full industrial democracy.

The more important part of the report is the second; but it will be useful to epitomize the findings embodied in the first part. In these there is little indeed that is unfamiliar to the student of current labor opinion. But three points of great consequence are secured: the maximum working week of forty-eight hours, the universal minimum wage, and the formal and obligatory recognition of the trade unions. The subordinate provisions bearing upon these subjects, together with a section dealing with unemployment, make up this part of the report. This will of course clear the air very materially; and as the bald recital of these points gives no real impression of their actual magnitude, they may be supplemented by a reference to the Sankey Report. The increase of weekly wages by a few shillings and the diminution of working hours by one does not look to be very much on paper; but it is estimated that the increase of two shillings a day in miners' wages (one shilling to workers under sixteen years) will cost, for the second half of this year, thirty million pounds, while the reduction of the working day by one hour during the same period is expected to lead to a decreased output whose value is calculated at thirteen million pounds. It is symptomatic of the trend of opinion that the Sankey Commission proposes to meet this increased expenditure by reducing the profits of the coal owners by no less a sum than thirty-nine million pounds. There will be left to them, however, the respectable amount of fifteen millions—so that they are not yet in sight of the poorhouse.

But undoubtedly the more momentous part of the report is that which deals with the proposal for a permanent representative National Industrial Council. This Council is meant "to secure the largest possible measure of joint action between the representative organizations of employers and work-people, and to be the normal channel through which the opinion and experience of industry will be sought by the Government upon all questions affecting industry as a whole." There will be four hundred members of the council, consisting equally of representatives of employers and of work-people, and presided over by the Minister of Labor. These representatives will be chosen by each side on a plan decided upon by the parties themselves. The council will meet at least twice a year, and it is to have a standing committee which will meet at least every month.

It is clear from the start that this council will play a large and controlling part in the economic life of the nation; and the very broad terms in which its scope is defined, and the character of its constitution, will make it a body of great influence and authority. It ought to do much in the immediate future to stabilize and develop the industrial life of the nation and to stimulate productivity. But it is questionable whether its importance on the economic side is as great as its significance as a political innovation. The council, it is true, has no legislative powers, but its authority within its own field will be so great that its findings cannot fail to find their way into the statute book.

What must be taken account of in this proposal is that it suggests the creation of a new representative body as a permanent part of the machinery of British Government. It is the virtue of that ancient sanctity, the British Constitution, that it can make room for innovations without inordinate upheaval; and so far there does not seem to be any opposition to this particular novelty. Yet it introduces a new principle into the practice of representative government. For the first time outside Russia a permanent governmental body is to be established on a functional basis of representation.

For some time past there has been a growing conviction that democratic institutions have failed to realize their early promise. This is not the place to specify the causes of this failure; but there can be no question as to the depth and the extent of the prevailing skepticism concerning the adequacy of representative government as it exists today. The democratic state in France has seemed to the workers to be so incurably bourgeois in its spirit and its operation that they have turned to the modified anarchism of the syndicalist movement, while its results have proved so little satisfactory to the bourgeoisie as to provoke the reaction toward authoritarianism which is associated with names like Bourget and Brunetière. Elsewhere the misgiving concerning the validity and fruitfulness of popular representation has been articulate in varying degrees; and there seems to be no doubt that the new British proposal arises from a conviction of the incompetency of Parliament to deal adequately with industrial questions.

The answer to the skepticism concerning democratic institutions is simply that their possibilities have not yet been fully explored. Hitherto we have been content with a single—the geographical—basis of representation; and we have hardly begun to realize the profound change in our social organization which has been wrought by the development of means of communication in the last half-century. Even yet all our thought of decentralization for the purpose of relieving the congestion which the modern state has by its voracity brought upon itself runs in the direction of regionalism. But the British project introduces the principle of functional decentralization. This new body, if it comes into being, will be a parliament of producers. The discussion of industrial production will be withdrawn from the floor of the House of Commons, though that body will still retain the last word upon the subject.

This proposal is undoubtedly an innovation, the issue and the possibilities of which it is impossible to forecast. Perhaps it is here that we are to find the new application of the democratic principle that is needed in order to revive our wilting democratic institutions. In any case, it is an interesting and instructive symptom of the present tendency away from the unitary and absolute state to a state which shall rather be multicellular and federalistic in character.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meredith After Ten Years

By SAMUEL C. CHEW

THE death of George Meredith (May 18, 1909) followed hard upon that of Swinburne. One of the earliest of Swinburne's publications had been a just and eloquent defence of "Modern Love" against the violent abuse of the *Spectator*; hence the appropriate coincidence in the fact that Meredith's last published word was a tribute in the *Times* to the dead poet. In the early sixties the two men had been much together for a time, but there was something antipathetic in their two natures, and in later years, though there was never any positive alienation, they drifted apart. To John Morley, Meredith described himself as "of excellent temper," but beyond doubt his was a difficult disposition to deal with. Judging by the English reviews that have reached this country, this has been abundantly proved by S. M. Ellis's recent biography. We in America shall have to wait a while before forming our own estimate of this iconoclastic piece of work, for it seems that difficulties have arisen with regard to copyright claims, and for the time being, at least, no copies of Mr. Ellis's book are permitted to leave the publisher's office. Meanwhile the reason has become apparent why Meredith declared that he would "most horribly haunt" anyone who should venture to write a biography of him. Having introduced his own personality into several of his books, did he not in later life perhaps consciously aim, like Wordsworth, to construct the estimate of himself that should be held by posterity? According to that estimate, we were to find in him something of "Weimar's proud elaborate calm," something of Olympian indifference, more of the serene clear-sightedness, touched with light malignancy, of the Comic Spirit. It needs but the introduction of a suspicion of the "taint of personality" and we picture him, not seated overhead with this Spirit, but himself subject to her volleys of silvery laughter and bathed in her oblique light. The poet who with such compact strength described the distempered devil of Self—

> That captain of the scorned;
> The coveter of life in soul and shell,
> The fratricide, the thief, the infidel,
> The hoofed and horned—

is himself seen to have been involved in the snares of the "scaly Dragon-fowl." Even the admirable sonnet, "Internal Harmony," savors almost of insincerity.

> So that I draw the breath of finer air,
> Station is nought, nor footways laurel-strewn,

is a fine saying that consorts ill with evident restiveness under by no means total popular neglect.

Ever since the recent revelations about Wordsworth's private life in France, no matter what the mitigating circumstances, no matter in what measure Wordsworth made amends, we have regarded in a different light what must be denominated his self-righteousness. It does not seem likely that any such cloud will come over Meredith's fame. It is not that the weaknesses of the two men were very different, though that is the case; the distinction lies in the fact that there was a degree of self-deception in Wordsworth, there was none in Meredith. The latter chose to hide certain facts from the world, but he knew himself and put his own weaknesses, along with those of his fellow-men, into his books. Evan Harrington, who "would be a gentleman" and who was ashamed of his low birth, is a direct and piercing satire upon Meredith's own mortification because of his socially inferior connections. A similar humiliation at his failure to win wide popular recognition may be at the bottom of the stubborn exaggeration of the defects in his style and mode of narrative which came over him about 1878. There is no need to analyse anew the qualities of that amazing style; it has had its hostile critics and its enthusiastic admirers; and the two positions are not necessarily irreconcilable. The difficulty is that the virtues of the literary artist are not Counsels of Perfection of which one cannot have too much. Rather they are Aristotelean, and become vicious if pushed to an extreme just as surely as if passed over too lightly. The familiar, as Pater says, becomes the banal, the strange degenerates into the grotesque. Pater might have added that subtlety of thought may be refined to the point of extinction, and elliptical expression may become the mercilessly obscure. Meredith's "wit" still delights many of us; but fashions in wit change as in other things. Who now reads Cowley? The simple truth is that most people within a few years will not have the time to be bothered with such things as "The Shaving of Shagpat"; still less with Sir Willoughby's leg. Even in "The Ordeal of Richard Feverel," which, if any of Meredith's novels is secure, has certainly its unassailable position in our literature, there is entirely too much to-do about "the Wise Youth" and other such people. When all is said, and when due homage is paid to the surpassing excellence of Meredith's manner at its best, it yet appears that in the long run that manner will be a heavy burden upon his fame.

In so far as the novels are concerned, the permanency of his fame is rendered additionally uncertain by the character of his subject-matter. There is too great a limitation of time and nationality and social stratum. Though truths applicable to all humanity gleam through their pages, there is too much of the nineteenth century, too much of Victorian England, and especially too much of the manners and motives of a certain self-styled "upper class." How swiftly that world is passing away! Meredith's satire was salutary, and is still invigorating; but the satiric is at best "a bastard and wandering Muse," and no other form of literature is so ephemeral. Already the point of many of his shafts is blunted; the manners that he depicted and laughed at seem more remote than those of the spacious days three-hundred-odd years ago. He is concerned, even when satirizing them, with artificial people—the landed aristocracy, the high-strung over-trained intellectuals. It is significant that when he descends to the lower levels in the social scale, the tendency to caricature, inherited from Dickens, becomes pronounced. Just as when in "The Hand of Ethelberta" Mr. Hardy essayed an escape from Wessex, failure was the result, so in "Rhoda Fleming," in spite of the deep feeling for social injustice that went into that book, Meredith seems to be depicting a world the intimate history of which remains unrevealed to him. The novels of George Gissing afford an instructive contrast. Gissing viewed with abhorrence the world that he delineated; he saw none of the small compensations in the lot of the poor which Dickens complacently emphasized; his hand never

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

became subdued to what he worked in. Yet, immeasurably inferior as an artist though he is to Meredith, and less subtle as a thinker, he has more to say to our generation. He saw through the whited sepulchre of commercialism to the charnel dust of militarism within. Not only did he prophesy clearly the great Clash of Peoples, but he saw beyond it the universal unrest that we now live amidst. "Demos," "Thirza," and others of his books are indictments of the system of society that breeds Bolshevism—none the less terrible because presented with disgust rather than with false (because inefficacious) sympathy. He won small recognition in his lifetime; his present vogue (if he may be said to have one) is the result of the realization that his Cassandra-warnings "In Peril of Change!" have been substantiated by the event. His world is pulsing with raging life; Meredith's, beside it, seems antiquated.

And this not the less so despite the fact that Meredith's trust in man's ability to guide himself aright along the proper paths of development made him a radical in the political and social sphere; a radical, moreover, some of whose doctrines are still in advance of the point that we have reached. His radicalism will not necessarily keep him in remembrance. Take, for example, his championship of women. He represents a great advance from the nominal adoration combined with secret patronage that Tennyson offered them; he protests against this "charity of chivalry." The novels of his last phase did much to influence opinion in favor of those women, "distracted by existing circumstances," who, suffering under the injustice of the marriage laws, had no redress. He looks forward to the time when the minds of women, nourished by "light," will no longer need to flatter the tyrant's pride, but with equal economic opportunities based on equal educational advantages can meet men as equals in a marriage of true minds. This has not yet come about in entirety, though in theory at least it is accepted everywhere today. But the reformer of the last generation becomes the singer of the commonplace today. It is within my personal experience that the present generation of young womanhood is inclined to resent Meredith's championship, finding therein another form of the "charity of chivalry." When the victors come, not only do they find the body of the leader by the wall but too often they wonder at the energy expended upon the conquest of some outer redoubt when the central fortress of injustice and privilege remains unbreached. Meredith realized this when he said that another generation reaps that which we speak in protest.

If his style, the nature of his themes, and the accomplishment of the reforms that he advocated all threaten the lastingness of his fame, back of all this there is a further and yet more dangerous consideration. Except in the library of the specialist and as kept alive by the requirements of the class-room, it is in the nature of prose to disappear from general reading much more rapidly than verse. One has only to contrast the prestige of our greatest writers of prose, such men as Hooker, Taylor, and Swift, with that of Shakespeare, Milton, and Pope, to admit the truth of this. Poetry breathes the finer spirit of the knowledge of life that is spread out over the three or four hundred pages of a novel. It is not for nothing that in Mr. Hardy's case, as in Meredith's, a philosophy of life of which only suggestions and illustrations are found in the novels is set forth in verse. Still, as in the days of Diogenes Teufelsdröckh, the only conquest of importance is that of new ideas. And Meredith's profoundest views of life, his interpretations, his remedies, and his counsels, are best expressed in his verse. There is much in it that time will shear away; that is the fate common to many poets. But much will remain.

The doctrine of love of "Earth" and trust in her is touched with a transcendentalism inherited from the poets of the romantic generation and traceable to the far past. There is much wholesome common sense in the advice to "Carry your fever to the Alps," and in the little poem called "Manfred" there is a sound protest against romantic introspection; but there is much still to be said in favor of the Christian antithesis of the "State of Nature" and the "State of Grace," and probably in the future Meredith's teaching of the relationship of Man and Nature will not be considered his finest thought. The great and memorable theme of his verse is the frank and joyous acceptance of the idea of evolution, that greatest contribution of the nineteenth century to the body of the world's ideas. The troubled generation that preceded Meredith's, of which Matthew Arnold is the type, faced the new fact with anxiety and alarm. Although Tennyson, superficially regarded, seems to meet the scientists half-way, he is at root suspicious and hostile towards the new order. There were others who repudiated the contention that the faith had not been once for all delivered to the saints nineteen centuries ago. Of such Francis Thompson is typical:

> The angels keep their ancient places;—
> Turn but a stone, and start a wing!
> 'Tis ye, 'tis your estrangèd faces,
> That miss the many-splendoured thing.

Meredith, on the other hand, greets joyfully the "Philosophy of Change":

> Sameness locks no scurfy pond
> Here for custom crazy-fond:
> Change is on the wing to bud
> Rose in brain from rose in blood.

His is a Doctrine of Development that ascribes to a gradual elevation from a lower to a higher plane all the good so far accomplished in life. In the sonnet called "The World's Advance" he describes that progress as not direct and sustained but a reeling spiral with many hesitations and backslidings, but progress nevertheless. Struggle is of the essence of life, and in the course of that struggle consciousness and morality have been gradually evolved. He thus explains what to Mr. Hardy is "the intolerable antilogy" of the birth of consciousness and a moral sense in humankind who are the creation of a blind and purposeless Will. It is not necessary to accept all the connotations in Meredith's Philosophy of Nature. He is an empiricist: he cannot explain the "Why" of evolution; he rejoices in the fact. He urges submission to the reign of Law—"Those firm laws which we name gods," which in the long run, working remorselessly, apportion out even-handed justice. To Mr. Hardy's passionate appeal to a passage in "King Lear":

> As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods;
> They kill us for their sport,

he seems to reply with another passage from the same tragedy:

> The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
> Make instruments to plague us.

It is this confidence in the moral order that sustains his faith when on severest trial. So trusting, he accepted as the work of essential retributive justice the downfall of France in 1870:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Forgetful is green earth; the Gods alone
> Remember everlastingly; they strike
> Remorselessly, and ever like for like.
> By their great memories the Gods are known.

The same trust bids him prophesy the regeneration of France. In this belief the stars, instead of seeming "frosty lamps illumining dead space," mere cogs in a great machine that grinds out good and ill indifferently, become spirits sister to the Earth, fellow workers that still sojourning yet still move onward in silent joy. Man must "look through Nature up to Nature's God"; he must not appeal from her to the Invisible with wailful prayers; he must not assume the merely æsthetic point of view nor be the nympholept nor search mystically for "symbol-clues" in the facts of life. Life to those who hold the freedom of the Woods of Westermain is seen as "a little holding, lent to do a mighty labour." Accepting this privilege and responsibility, man craves for no further goal than to live in his offspring and to bequeath the young generation no broken house; and when his appointed hour arrives he can sink back into the breast that gives the rose without shuddering. It is recorded in more than one poem inspired by the late war that some such trust in the final good of humanity, as the goal of such mighty ills, sustained through the gigantic conflict thoughtful and spiritually minded men. It is Meredith's glory to have given perfect expression to that trust.

Japan After the War

By J. INGRAM BRYAN

NO event since the beginning of Japanese intercourse with Western nations has so profoundly impressed the mind of the people of Japan as the defeat of Germany and the downfall of the Kaiser. To the average Japanese it had long seemed as though the Imperial throne of Germany were the last that could be shaken, and the Emperor of Germany the last monarch whose rule could be forcibly ended. With a constitution based on that of Prussia, and a military system modelled after that of Berlin, Japanese officialdom had grown accustomed to believing that everything so fashioned was scientific and certain to endure. The collapse of this system of government and its accompanying militarism before the superiority of Anglo-Saxon principles, valor, and arms came as a shock for which Japan was not wholly prepared. That one of the most powerful of modern monarchs should be forced to flee from his people and country in ignominy and shame, and to take refuge among strangers, is a tragedy astounding beyond measure to the Japanese mind. Steeped in emperor-worship and enamored of imperialism as are many Japanese, this collapse of Hohenzollern traditions and pretensions is very difficult for them to grasp.

Some may be disposed to affirm that this attitude is inconsistent with the sentiment proper to an ally. Let there be no misunderstanding on this point. Japan was and is an ally of the Entente, and honestly so. It entered the war sincerely desiring the defeat of Germany as an aggressive Power, particularly because victory for the Teutons would have been a menace to Japan's policy in eastern Asia. But Japan was not prepared to welcome so complete a discrediting of the Prussian system of government and of the military system upon which its own army is modelled. While President Wilson was declaring that the world must be made safe for democracy, and Premier Lloyd George was championing the liberty of small nations, Japan was careful to point out that it was concerned neither with democracy nor with liberty, but simply with its own interests in the Far East.

Germany had long been regarded as an obstacle to the progress of the Oriental races, and more especially of Japan. It was the Kaiser who started the "yellow peril" bogey, and in the Boxer Rebellion ordered his troops to teach the Orientals an unforgettable lesson. Japan could never feel quite safe so long as Germany was ensconced at Kiaochow. Established in that fortress of constantly-increasing importance, Germany was looked upon as a more formidable hindrance to the progress of Japanese policy, and the realization of Japanese ambition than was Russia in Korea and Manchuria ten years before. Russia had been driven out and replaced by Japan. To dislodge Germany was quite another matter. The war in Europe provided the necessary opportunity, and now the intruder has been replaced by Japan in Tsingtao.

The war has, however, brought about greater changes than Japan anticipated. Its effect will doubtless be as far-reaching morally and spiritually as it is politically and materially. Japan was quite prepared for such material results of the war as changes of national prestige and of international boundaries. But the outcome is evidently to be far more radical than this: the entire Teutonic system has been proved untenable and unfit to endure; the peoples of Europe are aflame with a passion for liberty and the rights of man; whole nations are up in arms against bureaucracy in all its forms. The greatest and most pretentious thrones of history have crumbled; the rulers of Russia, Austria, and Germany are no more, and no man cares; despotism and tyranny are everywhere trembling. Even to Japan itself this spirit has come, and disaffection smoulders. The rice riots last year were a rebellion as much against bureaucracy as against profiteering; they showed a state of deep dissatisfaction among the masses. The conviction is gaining ground that between position and profit there exists some secret and illegitimate relation. The wave of world revulsion toward democracy is approaching Japan—will the country's time-honored if rather outworn traditions sink or swim? To the official classes this is a serious question.

It was a clear realization of this state of affairs that caused the late Cabinet to relinquish office. The Terauchi Ministry had been constantly preaching the danger of democratic ideas and exercising a rigorous suppression of public sentiment. Everything savoring of democracy was denounced as "dangerous thought." But while public opinion was gagged, the profiteers were free to prey upon the people. The bureaucrats and the *nouveaux riches* were suspiciously friendly, and the people revolted against both. The rice riots proclaimed the downfall of the Cabinet, which realized it could no longer defy the national temper. The fact that the Cabinet had to yield to popular demand proves that the people have power even in Japan when they decide to exercise it. Unfortunately, however, a majority of the Japanese people have no way of voicing aversion and dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

content save by violence. Recent legislation has effected a broadening of the franchise, but much remains to be accomplished in the way of constitutional development.

To guide the country in safety through this period of unrest, and to preclude further contamination from European politics, is the absorbing task of Japanese officialdom. A Cabinet ostensibly democratic has been installed at Tokio. Its title to democracy consists mainly in the fact that all its members save two are commoners, but a Ministry retaining Viscount Terauchi among its principal advisors can hardly be accused of dangerously democratic proclivities. The appointment of so bureaucratic an official as Mr. Obata as Japanese Minister to China does not indicate the likelihood of a change in the policy formerly pursued in dealing with that country. The new Cabinet means simply a reshuffling of the cards to place the Seiyukai party in power, to appease the outcry of the populace against the bureaucracy, and to ease the minds of the Allies at the Peace Conference.

How Japan will ultimately view the present tendencies in Europe is an interesting question. The situation is complicated by the attitude of the Japanese press, which constantly reminds the nation that it was the bureaucracy in Russia, Austria, and Germany that led to the overthrow of monarchy, and urges Japanese officialdom to take warning. The time of severe test will come after the verdict of the Peace Conference is announced, for the future of the present Imperial Cabinet depends upon the outcome of those negotiations. At the Portsmouth Conference, in 1905, under the ægis of President Roosevelt, Japan got less than the people expected. The returning envoy was mobbed and the Cabinet was driven to resign. This was a minor upheaval compared with the state of things that will arise if Japan's expectations at the Peace Conference are disappointed. The fact that Japan selected for envoys men of family rather than men trained in diplomacy indicates a firm determination to adhere to ancient traditions.

Meanwhile the public mind is occupied with surmises and prognostications that show which way the wind is blowing. What are the main objects which the Japanese Government hopes to attain at the Peace Conference? Undoubtedly it desires to retain the South Sea Islands, taken from Germany. If Great Britain may keep colonies wrested from Germany, so also, it is insisted, may Japan. If Britain relinquishes its booty, then Japan cannot reasonably hope to retain the islands. Perhaps the chief desire of the Japanese Government at the Conference is for the firm establishment of its position on the continent of eastern Asia. While it is ready to return Kiaochow to China, as promised, the Government would like to hold it to suit the convenience of Japan, or at least to have China guarantee to make it an open port. But the progress of Japanese rule and enterprise in Tsingtao plainly indicates the anticipation of permanent occupation. Japan is, of course, already practically assured of the possession of southern Manchuria for the next hundred years, and has only to guard the progress of its exploitation from interference on the part of England and America to realize most of its ambitions on the continent.

Before the European war, Russia was regarded as the main objective of Japan's defence plans. Although America was more frequently mentioned in this connection, it was merely as a ruse to ward off suspicion in Russia. The officials of the Czar were never in the least deceived by this, however; and finally, after the American proposal to neutralize the railways in Manchuria, Japan felt bound to enter into a new treaty with Russia, together with a secret agreement guaranteeing the *status quo* along the common frontiers in China. This did not in any way preclude the continued progress of Japan's policy in China, but acted chiefly as a warning to countries like Great Britain and America, which were prone to meddle or to excite suspicion as to Japan's motives in China. Now that the war has eliminated Russia, America has come to be regarded as the chief obstacle to a realization of the policy cherished by the Japanese Government.

The enormous and unprecedented expansion of the American army and merchant marine, as well as the consolidation of the naval programme, during the war in Europe, to say nothing of the announcement that the United States has determined on further naval expansion, may be expected to cause profound solicitude in Japan. The Japanese press is already much occupied with the subject. It is asserted that if America continues to enlarge its navy, Japan will be obliged to follow a similar policy, although as a matter of fact Japan has long been so engaged, and at great expense. It is even hinted that America is now so ambitiously imperialistic as to wish to reach an equality with Britain in naval power, and thus at the same time to overawe Japan. The celerity with which America raised a great army and threw its troops along the European battle-front has amazed the Japanese who had always believed that soldiers could not be made without years of training, as in Germany, and that in any case the American was no fighting man. The natural inference now is that America could just as easily pour its military and naval forces into the Orient if occasion required. The European war has exploded the theory that great distances render successful attack impossible.

It may seem out of place to discuss such possibilities at the close of one of the most dreadful wars of history, and at a moment when peace is supposed to be returning to stay; but the subject is forced upon any one who honestly faces the future of Japan and its Far Eastern policy. If Japan can succeed in achieving its ambitions peacefully, well and good; but it is our duty to determine whether they can be so realized. The tendency of Japanese public opinion is to regard this war as giving the white races the whip hand, and to demand that Japan exercise every precaution to prevent the further extension of European authority over eastern Asia. Somehow the English-speaking nations must be made to assist, or at least to permit, Japan's policy of expansion in Asia. They will probably not consent to the extension of Japanese territory southward or westward; they must in justice, therefore, allow Japan to expand northward. Such is the theory. It would be an immense relief to Japan to have these problems definitely settled at the Peace Conference. A free hand for Japan in China and Siberia would rid the West of all trouble with Japan, perhaps for centuries, and would make the English-speaking nations permanently its friends. But time brings its changes. Asia's millions, educated, trained, and drilled in militaristic ideals and materialistic morality, would prove a world menace beyond anything the European war was fought to destroy. Japan's only hope of winning the Anglo-Saxon peoples to sympathy with its policy is to have a complete house-cleaning, and thus to prove to its friends that it is sincerely applying the principles for which the war was professedly fought.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May Comes Laughing

By HENRIETTA JEWETT KEITH

MAY comes laughing o'er the hills,
Apron full of posies,
Columbine and daffodils;
Leaves to June her roses;
Stands on tiptoe, so to reach
Laurel boughs and branch of peach;
Hangs a mist of rose on each.
Naught cares May for throbs and thrills—
Leaves to June her roses.

May comes stepping 'cross the fields,
Scattering her posies
From her apron's store that yields
Ladies-locks and meadow rue,
Buttercups all drenched with dew.
June waits back, with haughty air.
Not a button does May care—
June may have her roses.

May comes singing through the woods,
Planting thick her posies,
Violets in their purple hoods,
Bloodroot wrapped in leafy snoods;
Searches under leaves and mold;
Mayflowers pink discloses;
Trills a careless roundelay—
All the world's in love with May—
June may have her roses.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter had been running over the news from Paris, and as he read of the search for a "formula" that would reconcile irreconcilables, or would apparently make something out of nothing, he fell to pondering on the nature of treaties. For enlightenment he turned to his wise friend from the Orient. The diplomat smiled. "A treaty," he said, "is very like a conjuror's box—to the uninitiated there is nothing in it; it is just an empty box. But the conjuror, if he be clever, can draw all sorts of desirable treasures from his magic box. It all depends on the conjuror!"

* * * * *

INVARIABLY at a quarter past two the door of the Theresienkaffee opened to admit an exceedingly drab figure, with a woolly beard and a strange flat hat. It was Erich Muehsam, the peripatetic anarchist of the Munich pothouses, followed by his admiring pupils, who shared his doctrines and his beer whenever a generous outsider would put up the price of the delectable domestic beverage. The Drifter, partaking of his post-prandial Mazagran, was sometimes allowed to act as treasurer. If you ask him the reason for this strange generosity he must confess that he does not know it. Why did he and dozens of respectable citizens, addicted to soap and the amenities of civilized life, tolerate Muehsam anyway? Muehsam did not talk well. His manners were atrocious. His mind was as unappetizing as his collar. Yet he filled a certain definite place in the strange philosophic cosmos of modern Germany, and played his rôle upon the stage of Munich's communistic carnival. It was a ghastly farce. Pierrot made love with a machine gun. Columbine threw hand grenades. . . . It is all over. Quiet reigns on the banks of the swift Iser. In the Theresienkaffee, Fritz the head waiter carries in his pocket an unpaid bill that never will be settled.

* * * * *

FOR many years the *Nation* has relied on a gentle and scholarly personality to guide it safely in matters of taste, of the classics, of foreign phrases, of literary allusions, of half-remembered quotations. Julian de Kestel Hankin's graceful pen lightened the editorial paragraphs; his wide reading and critical discernment gave authority to his book reviews; his feeling for harmony was manifest in his judgment of poetry and music; his unfailing humor often brightened the Driftway. Even last week, as he gallantly faced a lonely death, he shared his rich experiences with the Drifter. He embodied the finest spirit of the old English universities. He wore his honors—degrees from Oxford and Dublin—modestly, and his learning lightly. The pursuit of classical literature was to him much more than an avocational pastime or the traditional recreation of a gentleman. In him, culture fulfilled its highest and nowadays most generally disregarded function of fortifying and ennobling the human spirit and maintaining its superiority to the inevitable failures, disappointments, and uncertainties of life.

> Who prop, thou ask'st, in these bad days, my mind?
> He much, the old man, who, clearest-soul'd of men,
> Saw The Wide Prospect, and the Asian Fen,
> And Tmolus' hill, and Smyrna's bay, though blind.
> Much he, whose friendship I not long since won,
> That halting slave, who in Nicopolis
> Taught Arrian, when Vespasian's brutal son
> Clear'd Rome of what most sham'd him. But be his
> My special thanks, whose even-balanc'd soul,
> From first youth tested up to extreme old age,
> Business could not make dull, nor Passion wild:
> Who saw life steadily, and saw it whole:
> The mellow glory of the Attic stage;
> Singer of sweet Colonus, and its child.

This is the best, the indispensable fruit of culture, and it was his. His death reminds the Drifter painfully that while the age produces literary technicians and trained reporters innumerable, the men of cultural distinction are passing rapidly away.

THE DRIFTER

Contributors to this Issue

LINCOLN COLCORD, associate editor of the *Nation*, was Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* during 1917-18.

RICHARD ROBERTS, pastor of the Church of the Pilgrims in Brooklyn, is a close student of British industrial development.

SAMUEL C. CHEW, associate professor of English in Bryn Mawr College, is a frequent contributor to the *Nation*.

J. INGRAM BRYAN is an American physician long resident in Japan.

HAROLD L. CLEASBY is associate professor of classics in Hunter College.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Wanted—Hopeful Signs

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Can you find no hopeful nor redeeming virtue in our present system? Is there no achievement of patriotic men and women you can find spirit and space to commend?

We are not any of us altogether satisfied. There is much that is drab and drear requiring a drumming into decency. There is also much that is fine and hopeful that heralds with trumpets a broader concept and nascent interest in the principles of social justice.

Go forth and find just a few hopeful signs and give them notice in your earnest way, that men by setting the good in their hearts be not wholly overcome by your doctrine of hopelessness.

San Anselmo, Calif., April 25 HENRY S. FOOTE

An International Farce-Comedy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Paul Freeman, Australian mine-owner, is about to begin his fourth trip across the Pacific Ocean on the steamship "Sonoma" because neither America nor Australia will permit him to land. His case exemplifies one of the most extraordinary farce-comedies which international law, with its limitless grotesque possibilities, has yet produced.

We have the word of two members of the Queensland Parliament that Freeman owns valuable mineral claims in Australia, and has for years borne a good reputation; *ergo*, he is not a dangerous character; neither is he diseased nor illiterate. Yet he was deported by the Australian authorities for making a speech to which the authorities objected, was refused the trial he demanded, and started on his way to America. Here he was refused admittance after much legal deliberation, and again returned to the Australian port only to be re-deported to America and denied a landing here.

Of course this pleasant little game might go on forever as in the case of "The Man Without a Country," but the absurd injustice of the proceeding has so impressed Australian labor unions that they threaten a general strike unless Freeman is permitted to land when the "Sonoma" again reaches its Antipodean terminus.

We have heard much concerning Australia as the world's political and economic Utopia—which makes it all the more difficult to understand why a Government based on altruistic principles should refuse any citizen a trial, and evade the responsibility by sentencing him to a battledore-and-shuttlecock existence upon the high seas.

Berkeley, Calif., April 28 GILMAN HALL

A Good Loser

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am an American, born in Mexico City, "raised" all over Mexico—mountain and valley, hot land and plateau, city, village, mine and ranch. I have acquired property in Mexico—a little—real estate and erstwhile "securities"—and I have lost both. I have friends in the oil business, in mines, rubber, coffee, cattle. They have lost, too. I have friends among the many Mexican exiles who watch and wait in New Orleans, Chicago, Paris, New York.

I believe I know the viewpoints of many of these Mexicans—and I also have somewhat of the point of view of the native Indian under whose thatch roof, and on whose earthen floor, I have often found a lodging for the night. And I want to thank you for the stand taken by the *Nation* on intervention, and for your reprinting that memorably beautiful manifesto of the three archbishops (I have heard those same sentiments, though in blunter terms, from laymen who had lost and suffered, too), and for the promise I gather from this action that yours will be an organ for any constructive attitude and programme that may be born from the aftermath of turmoil that now is.

Boston, May 9 A. E. HAMILTON

Voluntary Reunion

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a letter to the *Nation* of April 26, Mr. Frederick Franklin Schrader asserts that "for the Peace Conference to return the duchies of Slesvig-Holstein, or any material part of them, to Denmark, would be the grossest act of violence that could be perpetrated to cast ridicule upon the whole doctrine of self-determination."

In reply allow me to say that the Danish Government desires only that part of Slesvig returned to Denmark which of its own free will votes for a reunion. A plébiscite will shortly be held in Northern Slesvig, and the inhabitants will have free opportunity to express their wishes in regard to their future.

If Mr. Schrader can see any "gross act of violence" in this, he must be more German than the Germans themselves. For as early as November 14, 1918, the German Foreign Office officially proclaimed that "the German Government has adopted the standpoint that also the North Slesvig question must be solved in conformity with President Wilson's peace programme on the basis of the rights of the population concerned to self-determination."

Washington, D. C., May 3 ROGER NIELSEN

Public Opinion in The Making

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wonder to what extent reaction against such restrictive war measures as the Espionage Act has led to the adoption of the forum as an instrument in shaping public opinion. The people of England have for years known the efficacy of public debate as a means of effecting reforms. Richard Cobden did not win his Corn Law victory in Parliament. "Agitate! Agitate!" was his watchword. He and John Bright gave the people the facts and encouraged them to look at them from both the protective and free-trade points of view, with the result that when, after seven years of unceasing debate, Cobden arose in Parliament to urge his cause, the Peel Parliament capitulated because of the organized and intelligent public opinion that backed him.

In 1745 the little Kingdom of Saxony had for King August III, who had for Minister of State one von Bruhl, who had for ally the Court Confessor Guarini. Carlyle says: "They together have his Majesty in leash, and lead him as they please." This is the way it was done: "At four every morning, this Guarini comes to Bruhl; Bruhl settles with him what his Majesty shall think in reference to current business, this day; Guarini then goes and confesses his Majesty, turning in the due way to secular matters. At nine, Bruhl himself arrives for privy council. 'What is your Majesty pleased to think on these points of current business?' Majesty serenely issues his thoughts in the form of orders—which are found true to pattern." "This is the process with his Majesty," remarks Carlyle, "which cunning arrangement is more and more perfected every year."

There is an analogy, not so far-fetched as it might be, between this King of Saxony in 1745 and the sovereign American people in 1918. Mr. Creel was a "war measure," but now that the war is over let us hasten to reëstablish the sovereign people in position to do their own individual thinking.

Scranton, Pa., April 17 JUNIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Present-Day Socialism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* of March 29 a statement is made in the article entitled "Self-Government and Decentralization" which, if true, in view of current tendencies, would place socialism in a decidedly reactionary light. Now obviously, present-day socialism is a filtration of previous theory through the minds of men confronted with accomplished fact. In the writings of these men, vigorous as they are in support of Soviet Russia and in acclaiming the ascendancy of the socialist ideal, I fail to find the slightest basis for the contention that the postulate of socialism is centralization. As early as 1912, five years before the Russian revolution, even as orthodox a Marxist as John Spargo, in frankly advocating decentralization whenever practicable, wrote: "Where capitalist production has developed national organization, the Socialist State will start with that form, continue it if it seems best to do so, abandon it and adopt a process of gradual decentralization if that seems best." Mr. Spargo in 1912 was a representative American socialist.

Thus it appears that the equation, socialism equals centralization, finds support neither in practical contemporary socialism nor in orthodox socialist theory.

Ellenville, New York, May 2 JEAN TOOMER

A Foot-Note to Erasmus

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Professor Preserved Smith's article on the new information in regard to Erasmus which has been discovered in recent years, tempts me to add a note. Some years ago, when in London, a bookseller there showed me a copy of the Aldine edition of Gregory Nazianzene's* *Carmina*, Venice, 1504. The Greek text was accompanied by a Latin translation; but Aldus had printed the book so as to allow of the two languages being issued separately. This involved leaving blank the two inner pages of each folio of the Latin version. On these Aldus had begun to print the Greek text of the Gospel of John with a Latin translation, but only reached ch. VI, verse 58. At the end of the book was a note to the reader that the rest of the Gospel would be printed in the Latin version of Nonnus, which, however, was never done. If I am not mistaken this Johannine Fragment is the first considerable portion of the New Testament printed in Greek.

The chief interest of the volume, however, lay in the fact that it had once belonged to Erasmus, and bore his autograph and inscription on the title page. At the foot of the title Erasmus had written in his clear and characteristic handwriting:

"Sum Erasmi, nec muto dm̃."

"I belong to Erasmus, and I do not change my master."

Later Erasmus gave the work to a friend (was it Colet?) who had added to the original inscription:

"Fui Erasmi, et mutaui dm̃."

"I belonged to Erasmus, and I have changed my master."

Below this Erasmus had again written:

"Jure, vro mutaui, cu amicus sit alter ipse."

"I did right to change, for a friend is a second self."

It is enough to waken thoughts too deep for tears to know that this precious volume once cost a possessor of it the modest sum of seven shillings, six pence, and the binding fourteen shillings. The fortunate bibliophile was Michael Wodhull, who noted, under date "Mar: 23, 1770. L. Davis's sale, 7/6, mending and binding 14/-.1:1:6." The London bookseller asked £80 for it.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

University of Chicago, April 26

*Even Gibbon made the error of writing "Gregory *of* Nazianzene," and this form has become consecrated by using. Nazianzus was Gregory's brithplace. Hence one must write either "Gregory of Nazian*zus*" or "Gregory Nazianzene." See Bury's ed. Gibbon, I, 381, n.

Russia at the Cross-Roads

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have read with very great interest Mr. Lomonossoff's article in the *Nation* of March 1. Mr. Lomonossoff pointed out to his American readers that they have no course but to recognize the Soviet Government, because there can be no choice between Kolchak and Lenine. With this I cannot agree. The question may indeed arise whether Russia is really so unfortunate as to have to choose between two oppressors—Kolchak, the military dictator, or Lenine, the civil dictator.

I am not a partisan or an admirer of Kolchak, and I am an ardent adversary of the counter-revolution which, with the participation of Kolchak, was brought about in Omsk in November last. I am an opponent of it because it was there that the democratic Government—the Directoria—was overthrown. That Directoria was elected at the Ufa Convention, a convention composed of members of the Constituent Assembly and representatives of the municipalities and Zemstvos, all of whom were elected on the basis of universal suffrage. This counter-revolution was as heavy a blow at the heart of the Russian democracy from the right as the Bolshevist counter-revolution of November, 1917, was from the so-called left.

Kolchak committed a crime in overthrowing the Directoria and arresting and expelling its members, those honest Russian revolutionary patriots whom we met here only a short time ago, when they stopped in New York on their way to France. No sympathy with his deeds can be expressed. But we must be just to him.

It is not true that Kolchak has re-introduced the sale of vodka. The selling of vodka in Siberia, as a means of collecting revenue, was re-introduced by the Provisional Government of Siberia before its agreement with the Directoria and before Kolchak's entrance into it when it was reorganized as the All-Russian Ministry. It is strange for us here in America to blame any one for the re-introduction of the sale of vodka, when the question of prohibition has caused such a struggle among us.

Mr. Lomonossoff accuses Kolchak of re-introducing laws against the Jews, but in none of the many papers of diverse opinions published in Vladivostok have I found any indication of measures limiting the Jews, as introduced by Kolchak. Neither do I find in these papers any reference to Kolchak's re-introducing corporal punishment for soldiers, though these papers, especially the socialistic and democratic ones, give much space to Kolchak and his incautious policies.

Let us now make clear the work of the Soviets with reference to the Provisional Government at the time of its overthrow. The November counter-revolution of 1917, brought about in the city of Petrograd and causing the overthrow of the Provisional (the so-called Kerensky) Government, was not effected by the All-Russian Soviet of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, upon whose agreement, but despite whose decision, Kerensky accepted the power as Prime Minister. When the Bolshevist local Soviet of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates decided that it was necessary to overthrow immediately the Provisional Government and to transfer the power to the Soviets, the All-Russian Soviet of 1917 adopted a resolution pointing out that such an act was unnecessary and harmful, and it protested against this attempt. It pointed out, furthermore, that within one month the Constituent Assembly would be gathered to express the will of the whole people. The same position was also taken by the All-Russian Soviet of the Peasants' Delegates. But the Petrograd (local) Soviet, with Trotzky at its head, seized the power by means of physical force, in spite of the clearly expressed will of the representatives of the Russian revolutionary democracy.

Thus it is not true that the Russian people have no choice except that between Kolchak and the Soviets. The Russian people have a choice. The other way is through the Constituent Assembly to a commonwealth.

New York, May 10 C. OBEROUTCHEFF

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Our Newest Poets

The New Era in American Poetry. By Louis Untermeyer. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

THE title of Mr. Untermeyer's book promises more than the Prefatory Note, in which the author admits that he has merely assembled a series of articles written for the magazines during the past seven or eight years. His volume is therefore a good deal of a miscellany, held together only by a personal point of view. To say the worst things about the book first, its proportions are bad. John Hall Wheelock, whom Mr. Untermeyer for all his praise fails to make out anything but a trivial poet, has an entire chapter to himself, as if it were worth while to venture comparisons between him and Robert Frost or Vachel Lindsay or Amy Lowell. James Oppenheim, too, a windy and insubstantial writer, is here allowed a space, and a pæan, quite too large for any merits he has ever displayed or seems likely to display. Imagine an arrangement which seems to imply that Mr. Oppenheim is worth as much—judging by the room assigned him—as that exquisite group of lyricists, Sara Teasdale, Anna Hempstead Branch, and Lizette Woodworth Reese, with Edna St. Vincent Millay, Zoë Akins, Margaret Widdemer, Amelia Josephine Burr, Eunice Tietjens, Harriet Monroe, and a dozen other sweet-voiced singers thrown in to fill the measure! This may be argument, but it is not criticism. Against such eccentricities of proportion, however, should be set the honors more deservedly paid to Arturo Giovannitti, the pages usefully allotted to the "Others" and others about whom previous accounts have left us too vague, and the justified enthusiasm for Vachel Lindsay, so lamentably neglected by Amy Lowell in her "Tendencies in Modern American Poetry."

Mention of Miss Lowell's book suggests a further comparison, from which Mr. Untermeyer suffers. In masculine vigor and robustness he is of course inferior to her, as in the clearness of his ideas, the firmness of his arguments, and the niceness of his taste. He has even less humor than she, though he skims over thin ice and nearly falls into laughter when he tells of the Spectrist hoax and similar vagaries; he surpasses her in the number of poets he identifies and the number of *clichés* he employs in doing it. He writes unevenly, without much distinction; and though he glitters, he rarely warms. The total impression that his book leaves is a blurred impression: its emotion is not quite infectious, and its information not quite satisfying.

That its emotion is not quite infectious must be called Mr. Untermeyer's fault. Side by side with decently discriminating judgments he can let stand the most absurd. For instance, he ranks among "the most magical of American lyrics, not even excluding Poe's 'To Helen,'" a flat, banal piece with this incredible ending:

> "Van Wyck, how often have we been together
> When this same moment made all mysteries clear,—
> The infinite stars that brood above us here,
> And the gray city in the soft June weather,
> So tawdry, and so dear!"

To apotheosize such an anti-climax is more than absurd in itself; it casts doubt on the critic's right to pass any poetical judgments at all. Nor is Mr. Untermeyer always judicious on less specific points. Take as another instance his "sweeping generality," as he accurately calls it, that the new era has set American poets free from "a vague eloquence, from a preoccupation with a poetic past, from the repeating of echoes and glib superficials." The second phrase is right enough, but the first is amazingly wrong. Never since the rhetorical days of David Humphreys and the poets who prophesied the "rising glories" of America just after the Revolution has there been a time when a survey of current poetry could have shown so much vague eloquence, so many vast, cloudy, shambling notions as now. Almost all of us are more or less the poetical sons of Whitman, and how many, like other sons of other great men, have something of the paternal voice and gesture without the large, steady grasp, the authentic dimensions, of the sire! Mr. Untermeyer says that our poets no longer repeat "echoes and glib superficials." Granted that Robert Frost does not, or Edwin Arlington Robinson, or Amy Lowell often, or above all the crystalline "H. D."; but remember what Vachel Lindsay can do when he lends his lyre (his leaking accordion it then becomes) to the Anti-Saloon League; or Edgar Lee Masters when he tries to describe the gorgeous naughtinesses of Chicago; or Ezra Pound and several of the "Others" most of the time. No more dreadful example exists than the conclusion of John Gould Fletcher's poem on Lincoln. It would show in Mr. Untermeyer both a wider knowledge of literature and a larger knowledge of human beings in general had he admitted in his preface, what indeed he tacitly admits in the individual chapters of his book, that in an age so fecund as ours there has naturally been a great deal of poetic reverberation among the slighter figures and plenty of "glib superficials," while in the less admirable work of even the larger poets there are very muddled moments.

Justice, however, urges that we notice how often Mr. Untermeyer, in spite of his habit of spraying his target with shrapnel instead of doing a neat, sharp job with one bullet, yet manages—to change the image from war to peace—to bring down his bird. He nowhere writes better than about Frost and Robinson and "H. D.," from whom for the time being he appears to have caught a little of their steadiness. He sees how much better is "The Spoon River Anthology" than the undigested volumes which Mr. Masters has proffered since. He knows that Vachel Lindsay and Carl Sandburg are worse critics than poets, and so publish everything they write, magnanimously leaving the choice to Time, Chief Anthologist. He walks rather discreetly through the jungles of Ezra Pound, finding most of the cleared spots, which are not quite so rare as one might think. And with the many little people Mr. Untermeyer is often as fair as he is generally tender. When he has to touch upon several in a short chapter, he can do it well; for nothing is quite so sure to compel him to his best as the obligation to be brief. In such cases he often contents himself with giving information, of which he obviously has more than he has given. Such as he does give will excite his readers as his judgments will not. For Mr. Untermeyer is enviably at home in the brilliant era about which, however irritatingly at times, he has written a book nearly as indispensable for its general facts and outlines as Amy Lowell's is for its doctrines.

Heretics of War*

The Conscientious Objector. By Major Walter Guest Kellogg, U. S. A. New York: Boni and Liveright.

MAJOR KELLOGG approaches the problem of the conscientious objector largely through the personality of the objector himself. As chairman of the Board of Inquiry on Conscientious Objectors, he had ample opportunity of coming into close contact with these "heretics" of war. The preface contains the salutary caution that "The 'C. O.,' as the Army calls the objector, is not to be guessed at—one must know him to understand him." Unfortunately, a knowledge of the C. O.'s personality appears to furnish little new light on a problem which "has never yet received a satisfactory answer." Beyond some historical annotations and a brief résumé of the Government's solution of the difficulty in the present war, with suggestions for the future, the author has conveniently concerned himself with the C. O.'s personality rather than with his problem.

In point of view and treatment the book is a commendable attempt to consider dispassionately a matter which, in the nature of the case, cannot be viewed without apprehension by the mili-

*It may be of interest to our readers to know that this review was written by an absolutist conscientious objector still confined in the U. S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth.—Editor of the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary. But the author's unbiased text is considerably vitiated by his obviously prejudiced choice of incident, and of those passages of explanation offered by the objectors themselves in extenuation of their case. The fact that a certain objector, having accepted non-combatant service, is finally happy to wear his three chevrons is hardly an incident calculated to clarify the issue. The emphasis throughout the book is wholly upon the compromising case of the man who, though undoubtedly actuated by principles of conscience, is nevertheless capable of doing all he can in the prosecution of the war, short of bearing arms. This type, in modest numbers, presents no difficulty, because in modern war the non-combatant branches absorb fully as many men as the combatant, while at the same time the Government may avert, by a judicious liberalism in these cases, the fundamental issue involved. The man thus placed is absorbed in the greater mechanism of war with only a little shifting of the machinery; and neither the army nor the nation nor finally the principle at stake need be disturbed. This type the army has the good grace to tolerate. His services are scarcely less acceptable than those of men unburdened by restricting moral considerations; and if he belongs to a well organized religious sect where the danger—always imminent to the military mind—of an extension of the conscientious principle involved is gratuitously limited, he becomes an acceptable if not a commendable member of the army. Thus sixty per cent. of the C. O.'s in the present war, accepting as they did non-combatant service, comprised in reality only an administrative problem. Of the remaining forty per cent., practically all were prepared to accept furloughs for reconstruction work or for farming; and a slight residue of perhaps not three per cent. is left, consisting of those who were absolutely unable to further war's demands. These latter are the so-called absolutists. A facetious liberty with statistical fact might permit one to see in these percentages the exact tolerance which the army extends to the groups indicated. Although it is good, for some reason not emphasized, to preserve the principle of freedom of conscience, nevertheless the stricter the position of the objector the more misguiding his conscience must be adjudged. Such, at bottom, is the contribution toward the enlightenment of the subject with which Major Kellogg favors us. The maxim might be stated thus: Policy is the best solution for principles.

Throughout the volume there is a naïve assurance that Governments are actuated always by benign motives in behalf of justice, and that whatever they find themselves bound to do must inevitably be good and true. This leads us into interesting byways. We are assured in the preface that peace is the great desideratum; therefore the man who cannot be counted upon to fight is a menace. Freedom must be preserved, even at the expense of submitting to conscription. Most people accept these paradoxical arguments on the plea of war-time necessity; they reserve a submerged doubt for the time when peace is again established. Major Kellogg, misinterpreting the absolutist's motives, is oblivious to these questionings. "The objector," we are told, "although a manifestation of war, is essentially a product of peace." Actually, he appears to be a product of conscription. But Major Kellogg seems astonished to find that "They utterly refuse to submit to conscription: they will play no part in the military establishment." And again, speaking of the absolutists, he says: "Many of this class are unquestionably sincere; what, however, is their sincerity worth?" The answer is sufficiently simple but the author remains blithely unconscious of it and warns us—notwithstanding the victorious conclusion of "the war to end war"—that in the event of another war this problem may well be far more bothersome!

The absolutists have set an example which, if followed, would bring the world directly and appreciably nearer to a durable peace. They have contributed to a world which has ever sought peace through war the daring thought that peace may be secured by refraining from war. They have insisted by their very inaction that the terms of peace shall be arrived at without the process of war. Their absolutism is, in fact, directed mostly against conscription, as the greatest denial of that integrity which alone can prevent national stampedes. Germany understood all this very well. We learn that as far back as the eighteenth century "Germany . . . forbade the Mennonites to hold land, because of their opposition to military service." In Major Kellogg's book, written, let us remember, after a successful war for peace, we read that for "men who are unwilling to do any service whatsoever in the army or under conscription . . . deportation seems none too severe." One is slightly amused on reading further to find that, if these men are not acceptable in other countries, they should be isolated where they could argue to their heart's content about peace and internationalism, while (the implication is clear) saner men fight about them.

In closing, Major Kellogg quotes Socrates's argument with Crito, in which Socrates adjures us to follow the law for the greater good of the State. One wonders if the Board of Inquiry, trying the old gentleman for lack of piety toward the ancient deities, would not have found him culpably sincere, and therefore (as in the verdicts of our own courts martial) to be given the death-sentence.

Far Eastern Trails

Samurai Trails. By Lucian Swift Kirtland. New York: George H. Doran Company.

Camps and Trails in China. By Roy Chapman Andrews and Yvette Borup Andrews. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Peking Dust. By Ellen L. La Motte. New York: The Century Company.

THE continent of Europe, no longer the playground but now the workshop of the world, is no place for an idler. He who with knapsack and staff would follow a green path along the high ridges, dropping down at dusk into the friendliness of a village and the refreshment of a cool inn, will find Japan the ideal country for the wayfarer. Mr. Lucian Swift Kirtland knew this when he set out to follow "Samurai Trails," first along the oft-pictured Tokaido and then by the mountainous Nakasendo, those classic roads over which the daimyo journeyed in splendor to Yedo. Mr. Kirtland was not only equipped with intelligent expectations; he had, besides, a sympathetic imagination and a genuine fellowship. To the reader who may have known the keen delights of tramping in Japan his pages will bring many a homesick pang for old temples, black-eyed babies, red-cheeked girls, foaming torrents, forest-clad heights, and the glory of Fuji at dawn. Such a reader will quickly give a negative to the author's question: "Is it idolatrous to worship Fuji?" Mr. Kirtland neither assumes entire ignorance on his reader's part, nor does he take everything for granted. His comments give the proper setting to the picture. He is not concerned to mark all the strangeness and points of difference, nor the general inferiority of un-American ways. His adventures are neither exciting nor unusual: they are what come to him who swings the pilgrim's staff, but they are full of flavor and freshness. One gladly keeps pace with the three friends (to say nothing of the bicycle) to the end of the trail, enjoying even a vicarious share in their poverty; and one hopes to have a tryst with them again. The illustrations that accompany this simple chronicle are not many, but they are characteristic and well-chosen.

China is not intended for the traveller on foot; bad roads, bad inns, and vast distances bid him defiance. No exquisitely neat inn offers a dainty repast after the refreshment of a boiling bath—as in Japan. Food and bedding and shelter must be packed along by coolies, by weird horses, or by springless carts. Thus the well-equipped traveller sees (and smells) but does not share the native life—for which the traveller is devoutly thankful. Mr. and Mrs. Andrews, with an elaborate caravan, went across Yün-nan, in the interior of China, on a scientific expedition, gathering specimens for the American Museum of Natural History. Their interests were naturally scientific and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not æsthetic; and the record of their trip, "Camps and Trails in China," is more a plain tale of events and observations than a literary or spiritual adventure. Two healthy young people, having little background or imagination, and never forgetting that they are Americans, may have a cheerful and interesting journey, and bring back valuable skins and skeletons (and a live bear-cub), and still not impart much atmosphere to their account of their experiences. Mr. and Mrs. Andrews do, however, stimulate a desire for travel, and they make interior China seem the natural place to begin. The numerous photographs which illustrate their volume are accurate but perfunctory.

Miss La Motte has not chosen to follow the camels' path on their slow journey from the walls of Peking across the Gobi Desert; she has imbibed her share of desert in "Peking Dust." The "trail" she has chosen is a back alley of Western civilization. Her observations in China have shown her that "There is a back side to this structure of civilization; there are outbuildings, slums, and alleys, not visible from the front. These back on the Orient, and the rear view of the structure of European Civilization, seen from the Orient, is not imposing at all. The sweepings and refuse of Western Civilization and Western morality are dumped out upon the Orient, where they do not show." Miss La Motte's book is not a serious study, but a vivid flashlight revealing situations that are often clouded. It may not be "authoritative," but it makes clear the intricacies of the foreign Powers and their "spheres of influence" in China —mysteries too often nebulous to those who have not been in China. Miss La Motte has set down her first sharp impressions. She kept her eyes open (in spite of the dust), and she comments pungently on what she saw. Japan, she says, "has attained eminence without the assistance of the Great Powers . . . without having had the blessings of European Civilization conferred upon her by a conqueror!" And to that fact she attributes part of the current prejudice against Japan.

The Technique of Play-Making

Dramatic Technique. By George Pierce Baker. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

IT is remarkable, considering the wide interest in the subject, that we have had no really good book on the technique of drama. At one extreme, we have had academic treatises; at the other, such an antiquated theatrical manual as Hennequin's. On the whole, the best book to recommend to a struggling playwright has been William Archer's "Play-Making"; but this leans too far toward philosophical theory to be of much practical value. What we have needed is a book based on wide and scholarly knowledge of both theory and practice, a book showing at once philosophical grasp and an intimate acquaintance with practical details. Such a book Professor Baker has now given us in his long-expected "Dramatic Technique." A lifelong student of drama, who has done more than anyone else in America to vivify its teaching and study, Mr. Baker has had the immense practical advantage of many years' experience in working with and advising young playwrights, and in directing an experimental theatre. A better or more thorough equipment for his task could scarcely be imagined.

The author's aim is modest. "This book," he says in his preface, "tries in the light of historical practice merely to distinguish the permanent from the impermanent in technique. It endeavors, by showing the inexperienced dramatist how experienced dramatists have solved problems similar to his own, to shorten a little the time of his apprenticeship." He adds: "I wish it distinctly understood that I have not written for the person seeking methods of conducting a course in dramatic technique. I view with some alarm the recent mushroom growth of such courses throughout the country. I gravely doubt the advisability of such courses for undergraduates." The sincerity of these statements is proved by the fact that the book contains no discussion of the one-act play, usually emphasized in college courses; this is reserved for later presentation. Mr. Baker apologizes for what may seem the dogmatism of his treatment; but the apology is unnecessary. The book is remarkably free from academic or other dogmatism; it is everywhere tentative and empirical.

What chiefly distinguishes the work from its predecessors is the wide sweep of its induction. The author's question always is: "In what different ways has a given problem been successfully solved?" Every suggestion, every conclusion, is based on a number of definite instances; and these are cited, often at considerable length. One's first impression is that the book is overloaded with illustrative matter; but in fact its chief practical value lies in these carefully selected and thoroughly analyzed citations. They require close study and repay it; they vitalize and illuminate the generalizations at every point. No series of directions for preparing a scenario, for instance, would be so likely to help an inexperienced dramatist as the scenarios, complete and incomplete, actually quoted and criticised.

The inclusiveness of Mr. Baker's generalizations may be suggested by a reference to his discussion of "The Essentials of Drama" in Chapter II. What is the central requirement of drama? Conflict, answers Brunetière, speaking for the older theorists. But the practice of modern dramatists has shown that conflict is not always a necessity. Crisis, answers William Archer; but even this is not sufficiently inclusive. Not "action," not even crisis is central in drama; emotion is really the one essential. It is doubtful whether we are justified in calling any story essentially undramatic. The word "dramatic" means "creative of emotional response." Drama means "the presentation of an individual or group of individuals so as to move an audience to responsive emotion of the kind desired by the dramatist, and to the amount required. This definition includes the "well made play" at one extreme, and the "slice of life" at the other; it includes the Elizabethan tragedy of blood, and the almost actionless plays of the Russians. It will not, we think, be easily bettered.

The most serious defect of the book is an occasional lack of clearness in organization. Thus, there are four chapters dealing chiefly with plot, all headed "From Subject to Plot": III, Clearing the Way; IV, Clearness through Wise Selection; V, Proportioning the Material; VI, Arrangement for Clearness, Emphasis, Movement. Plainly there is some overlapping here, and the divisions might be made more distinct. Suppose a reader wished to find the discussion of the problem of exposition, for example. He would probably look first in Chapters III and IV; actually, the discussion is divided between V and VI, with further comments in Chapter VIII.

In style, too, the book leaves a good deal to be desired. There are many ungraceful colloquialisms, such as "shaping up his story" (p. 109); and not infrequently sentences so involved and awkward as considerably to embarrass the reader. The following is an extreme instance: "Surely it must now be evident that if a dramatist should in the first place understand perfectly that illustrative action is the core of drama, and must be carefully selected; and secondly that he must, among possible illustrative actions, select those which quickest will produce the largest emotional results; he must also recognize that till he has searched and probed his situations by means of the characters, in the first place he cannot know which are his strongest, and in the second place cannot hope to hold the situations chosen" (p. 109). A summary in this form defeats its own end.

Such defects will not seriously interfere with the usefulness of the book. Mr. Baker has the rare distinction of having been a pioneer in two fields; and the faults of his work in both have been the faults of the pioneer. He gave us our first good book on argument; better ones have since been written, but they could not have appeared unless he had shown the way. It is possible that someone else may write a better book on dramatic technique —unless, as we may hope, Mr. Baker should decide to write it himself. But any such book must owe to this one a great part of its merit.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Records of New York Jewry

The Jewish Communal Register of New York City, 1917-1918. Edited and published by the Kehillah (Jewish Community) of New York City.

THE Jewish population of New York City represents by far the largest Jewish community in the world; it is nearly five times as large as the second largest Jewish community, which is that of Warsaw, the capital of Poland. And as it is the largest, so it is also, with the possible exception of the Holy City of Jerusalem, the most heterogeneous aggregate of Jews on the surface of the globe. It reflects the successive waves of Jewish immigration from the lands of oppression, and contains practically every known type of the tribe of the wandering foot.

The earliest Jewish settlers of New York, who escaped from the Spanish Inquisition in Central and South America (the arrival of the first large party of Jews in New Amsterdam dates from the year 1654), were followed in the nineteenth century by Jewish immigrants from Germany, who fled from the anti-Jewish restrictions in the Fatherland. The accession of Alexander III to the Russian throne in 1881, inaugurating a policy of pogroms and inhuman persecutions, started the exodus of the Jews from the dominions of the Czars, and these Jews were joined by refugees from other countries of Eastern Europe, such as Rumania, Galicia, and Hungary, and, in more recent times, from various parts of the now defunct Turkish Empire.

In addition to these geographical divisions, the Jewry of New York, particularly the section hailing from Eastern Europe, reflects the innumerable lines of cleavage which have been created by the social and cultural upheavals on the other side of the water. There is scarcely a movement or current of thought in Eastern Europe which has not found its exponents and devotees among the Jews of New York. This extraordinarily diversified make-up of New York Jewry has proved a serious handicap in its development and in its adaptation to the new environment.

A number of far-sighted Jews of the city realized this condition nearly a decade ago, when they advocated the creation of a centralizing agency which should endeavor to unite the heterogeneous masses of New York Jewry in the aspirations and activities common to all of them, and should prepare the way for a future uniform type of American Jew. Such an agency was created in 1909 under the name of "The Jewish Community of New York City," popularly known by its Hebrew name as "The Kehillah." The Kehillah is made up of delegates from synagogues, societies, and federations, who meet in annual convention. The executive committee which is elected by them annually (its chairman has been Doctor J. L. Magnes) is entrusted with the conduct of the affairs of the organization.

Being primarily a coördinating agency, the Kehillah does not aim at controlling the existing Jewish institutions, but rather endeavors to help these institutions by investigating and formulating the problems confronting the Jewish community. It is in pursuance of this policy of coördination that the Kehillah has projected an annual publication entitled "The Jewish Communal Register of New York City," the first issue of which, covering the years 1917-1918 (the Jewish religious year 5678), has recently appeared.

The Register, in the words of its editors, is to serve two purposes: "It will help the individual Jew and the Jewish Community to see themselves as they really are in relation to each other," and "it will add to the progress of the general community and of the country as a whole by furnishing the proper materials and the proper view-point for a true understanding of the efforts the Jews in the foremost city of America are making to contribute their share to the fulfilment of the best ideals of American life." The Register, which covers 1536 pages, mostly in compact type, contains an astounding mass of information, based on careful investigation and study, about every phase of Jewish life in New York. The religious, cultural, and philanthropic, as well as the social and economic, agencies receive equal attention, in the form of both statistical material and summarizing reports. Some of the results embodied in the Register are of considerable general interest. The Jewish population of Greater New York is computed, on the basis of careful estimates, at 1,500,000, the bulk of which hails from Eastern Europe, particularly from Russia. The number of Jewish school children is at least 275,000. There are nearly 4,000 Jewish organizations of various kinds in New York City. The amount of money spent by them annually is calculated at nearly eighteen million dollars.

The maladjustment between supply and demand in the Jewish community is perhaps nowhere so palpable as in the field of religious education. For, in spite of the extraordinarily high standards of Jewish education which are part of the religious tradition of the Jewish immigrant, fewer than twenty-five per cent. of the Jewish children receive a systematic religious instruction—and this notwithstanding the fact that the Jewish community of New York spends $1,250,000 annually on that object. The report on the philanthropic activities shows a steady decrease of dependency, due to the fact that the Jewish immigrants "make every effort to care for themselves and thus remain self-respecting as well as self-supporting." The same spirit of self-help is evidenced by the large number of mutual aid societies and fraternal organizations which cater to the economic, but frequently also to the cultural and educational, needs of the immigrant Jew. The Register, which is amply illustrated by photographs and statistical tables and charts, will prove an indispensable vade-mecum to all those who have a direct concern in the affairs of New York Jewry, or who are interested in them from a general sociological point of view.

The Middle-Aged in War-Time

Blind Alley. By W. L. George. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

The Fire of Green Boughs. By Mrs. Victor Rickard. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

The Undefeated. By J. C. Snaith. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

A REVIEWER has greeted Mr. George's new book as the first "morning after" novel of the war. The phrase suggests its dazed, disgusted mood—a mood of which the writer himself seems hardly conscious, despite his choice of title. It is, he says, his best novel, "because it is the most cosmic attempt I have made to show a complete world society in the midst of a world movement." Commending the super-superlative "most cosmic" to the shades of Bottom and Pistol, we turn our eyes with moderate hopefulness upon this Georgian world. Blind alley indeed—a world of fumbling and negation: a muddle with little meaning and no promise of solution! The middle-aged Englishman of the story might be described as a Mr. Britling guessing again. Sir Hugh Oakley is a country gentleman, banker, and solid man, with more brains than traditionally belong to his type. At one time or other in this narrative we find him, always well-meaning and earnest, on every conceivable side of the world-question summed up in the war. In feeling he is by turns Little Englander, jingo, pacifist, socialist, pro-German, war-patriot, universal brother. He "does his bit" in all established ways, from war-worker to private in the Foreign Legion. On the whole, he draws steadily away in sympathy from his own class. He never goes the length of his invalided boy Stephen, who cries: "We've got to get rid of wealth, and rank, and good manners, and decent clothes, and art, and beauty and religion—make a clean sweep and get the world down to a decent uniformity of a pound of bread a day and one hat per head. We've got to start again from the level of intellectual barbarism. Got to break up this society that's gone bad; it's past mending." Sir Hugh is of too balancing a mind to find a cure-all anywhere. He fears revolution, but distrusts the old order of the ruling class. He has little hope of labor, since "Labor has voted for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hate." Socialism he sees as an "alternative tyranny, because it is worked by alternative tyrants." No hope appears of the triumph of the Wilsonian ideals which for a moment had warmed the world. It is all a mess, with no way out. Apart from its main bulk of controversial dialogue and speculative soliloquy, the book contains a story illustrating once more this writer's conviction of the animality of women—all women—and the brutality of men.

"The Fire of Green Boughs" has, at all events, its "answer" to offer. Mrs. Rickard says: "It's all wrong and here's what the trouble is." By way of her story, which is her real concern, she harps upon sacrifice of the younger generation by the elder, in the present war. The young are the green boughs blasted if not devoured by the flame of war, and it is the old men who have tossed them into the flames and now warm their pride and folly at the blaze. Such is the cheerful "idea" of the book. There is a youth who comes back ruined body and spirit; and before he shoots himself his ruling thought is hatred of the older men who have stayed at home while he suffered. "I'd put up gibbets all over Europe," he says, "and hang every man who was over military age and then there would be a clean world again." He imagines these elders gloating over the power that is once again in their hands. "Just when the younger generation was beginning to take its share in the affairs of the world, and was hoping to counteract the Victorian influences of the older generation, this war has come to silence us,—permanently or temporarily as the case may be. Meanwhile the old men are having field days of their own." Down with the Britlings! What right have they to be alive, seeing it through, when so many young men have died, fighting it through? A similar idea has been expressed, or hinted at, in several recent novels—an ominous sign. Are not our race wars and industrial wars and class wars enough without trumping up a war of generations? Is not the word "generation" itself a word of artifice in such a connection? Who can really determine, or approximate, where the "older" generation ends and the "rising" generation begins? Does Mrs. Rickard or anybody else seriously believe that any one "generation," or any other determinable half-world of mankind, has monopolized the responsibility for this war, or its conduct, or its suffering? As a story and apart from this idea, the book is better than its popular forerunner, "The Light Above the Cross Roads." It is a well-told Anglo-Irish romance, not of the war so much as of certain lives maturing, before our eyes, under the rapid forcing of the war-atmosphere.

Such a story also is "The Undefeated," but in a simpler and more wholesome way. Instead of a middle-class Britling or a patrician Sir Hugh, we have here the self-made magnate of a provincial city, and his son-in-law, a middle-aged failure of the same social class. One has come up a bit in the world, the other has slid down; but they are both to be roused and made over by the experiences of England at war. Josiah Munt, publican and Mayor of Blackhampton, is a notable portrait, unsparing enough in outline, yet colored with sentiment—as in Mr. Bennett's hands it would have been colored with irony. He is the social pusher, the domestic tyrant, the political power who dominates by sheer will, energy, and lack of scruple. William Hollis is, one may say, a more robust Mr. Polly in a more stirring world. Munt the successful man of affairs is in peril of living out his life as a petty tyrant and egotist; Hollis the impractical dreamer is on the slack road towards the end of an idler and a sot. Their problem is not the complex problem of the Sir Hughs. The war means for them a certain duty or series of duties lying straight ahead. Munt proves to be the most useful man to England in his district; Hollis takes his place in the trenches, not only once in his character of self-acknowledged failure, but twice, as one who has shown his colors and deserved his belated happiness in marriage and prospective fatherhood. Into the meaning and larger consequences of the war Mr. Snaith does not go. His bit of testimony, which may fairly be heard among others, is that out of the war for the Munts and the Hollises of many a community has come "somehow good," a good not without its promise for the years to come.

Books in Brief

PROBABLY Mr. Edward J. O'Brien, in "The Best Short Stories of 1918 and the Yearbook of the American Short Story" (Small, Maynard), has done his work of selection and evaluation as well as any one man could do it; and surely few critics so well qualified would be willing to read all the short stories in more than fifty American magazines, as he has apparently done. The "Yearbook" section contains indexes, lists, statistical tables, and "Rolls of Honor," similar to those which have been a feature of the four earlier volumes of the series. The stories chosen for reprinting are twenty in number. Twelve are taken from the conservative quartette of American magazines: the *Atlantic*, *Harper's*, *Scribner's*, and the *Century;* the other eight are from various periodicals, including the *Saturday Evening Post*, the *Pictorial Review*, and the *All-Story Weekly*. Somewhat more than half deal in one way or another with the war, and several are what would be called "war stories." It is with a feeling of disappointment that the reader finds in not one of the twenty any marked distinction of concept or style. They are not commonplace, but they are not clear-cut; and several which introduce or hint at the supernatural show an odd vagueness and mushiness, rather than any real faith or bold imagination. In this connection, Mr. O'Brien's remarks in the opening paragraphs of his Introduction are notable: "The short stories published during the last ten months show clearly that the war has numbed most writers' imaginations. . . There has been a marked ebb this year in the quality of the American short story. Life these days is far more imaginative than any fiction can be, and our writers are dazed by its forceful impact. . . . If this war is to produce American masterpieces, they will be written by men of middle age looking back through the years' perspective upon the personal experiences of their youth. Such work, to quote the old formula, must be the product of 'emotion recollected in tranquillity.'" The entire Introduction to this year's volume is of more than usual interest.

OF recent books on the problems of life, past, present, and future, Dr. Robert W. Mackenna's "The Adventure of Life" (Macmillan) is one of the most attractive for the general reader. The charm of it consists partly in the ease and clarity of its literary style, by means of which much purely scientific and highly instructive matter is robbed of its customary obscurity and dryness; partly in its wide and liberal scholarship; and partly in its profound sincerity and aptness of illustration. The author is an army physician, and this work, which is a sort of sequel to an earlier volume entitled "The Adventure of Death," is frequently indebted to his active experience in the field of battle. Upon the main object of it, a refutation of the materialistic theory of the origin and development of the earth and its inhabitants, it is not necessary to dwell. Dr. Mackenna writes throughout from the point of view of an ardent believer in an almighty God as the creator and director of the universe, and in the immortality of man. His arguments, necessarily, are along the lines familiar both to skeptics and believers, but they are set forth with orderliness and lucidity, and seek their foundation in reason as well as in faith. His references to either the Old or the New Testament are few and far between, although he refers to the Divinity of Christ and the actuality of revelation. In form and spirit his book is largely scientific. All controversy of this kind, of course, centres finally upon the characteristics of the primæval atom and whence it sprang. But both in his speculations and deductions, Dr. Mackenna furnishes much solid food for thought to the intelligent lay reader and not a little, perhaps, even to the expert biologist and physiologist. Sociologists, certainly, will read with lively interest his admirable chapter upon heredity and environment, and his eloquent appeal for slum reform in which he demonstrates how modern civilization, by its neglect, is out-Heroding Herod in its slaughter of the innocents and fostering all the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingredients of future catastrophe. His essay on predestination and free will, clever as it is, is not always convincing, even from his own position. The suggestion that disastrous natural phenomena may be regarded as special manifestations of Divine wrath has its obvious difficulties. The soul Dr. Mackenna defines as "that directive factor and controlling principle, which is responsible for our personal identity, our expression of ourselves, our personality. Linked to the body through the mind and brain, it is the energetic factor responsible for the weaving or development of the body along the lines set by species or heredity. It reaches down to the body but it also reaches up with expectant hands into the vastness of the Infinite." Here, plainly, scientific knowledge is supplemented by faith. But in discussing the origin of the principle of life itself in the primal atom, he expresses the belief that its source must be sought in one of the rays of the sun, beyond the violet spectrum, about which as yet science knows little or nothing. Here, he thinks, is some form of energy which expresses itself through protoplasm alone. His enumeration of the various new problems and possibilities arising out of this theory, and his discussion of them, offer the widest scope to an active imagination. He is on more solid ground, and is equally interesting, when he writes on the subject of pain and its beneficent influence in the scheme of the universe; of wounds on the battlefield, and of the attitude toward war of the men who have had the severest personal experience of its waste and horrors. The book is well worth the attention of every intelligent reader.

"THE warm, transforming radiance that a real letter needs for its very life" is present in the "Letters of Harry James Smith" (Houghton Mifflin), from which these quoted words are taken. Cut off in early prime by an accident to which his war work had exposed him, he yet left a more than respectable sum of achievement in drama and prose fiction, and would surely have gone far on his chosen way had he filled out the span of life to which he was looking confidently forward. The letters selected for publication begin a few months before the writer's entrance at Williams College and are continued, from many places on two continents, almost to the very day of his untimely death in British Columbia, where he was directing the collection of sphagnum moss for surgical dressings. They constitute the story of an ardent and mirthful spirit finding its appointed work and rejoicing in the finding, and belong in the same class with William Vaughn Moody's high-hearted correspondence and Edward Rowland Sill's equally memorable letters, all three young men working their way to literary production through the teaching of English—Smith to fiction and play-writing, Moody to poetry and both metrical and prose drama, and Sill to poetry and essays. All three were beloved of the gods and died young. Smith's ingenuous delight in his own powers and sublime confidence of success are voiced in his letters and add distinctly to their charm, there being no trace of bumptiousness in the humorous expression of his high hopes and the jubilant enjoyment of their occasional realization. "Mrs. Bumpstead Leigh," "A Tailor-Made Man," and "The Little Teacher" are the best-known of his plays; "Amédée's Son" and "Enchanted Ground" are his chief works in fiction. Juliet Wilbor Tompkins supplies an Introduction to the letters.

OF late years Meredith's "Essay on Comedy" has been placed on the lists of required reading in many college courses in English literature; and the young student, while often stimulated by it, has had to grapple with the many and condensed allusions in it to the whole field of comedy. Professor Lane Cooper's edition in "The Modern Student's Library" (Scribners), a series that we have recently commended several times to our readers, therefore should become widely used, for the full notes explain nearly all the allusions in the text. The Introduction contains a brief account of Meredith's career to the time of the publication of the "Essay"; an excellent discussion of Meredith's theory of comedy, reinforced by a reprint of the opening chapter of "The Egoist," the novel which may be regarded as an elaborate illustration of the general principles enunciated in the "Essay"; and a somewhat less satisfactory review of the features of Meredith's style as seen in the "Essay." Mr. Cooper admits that, unlike Matthew Arnold, in whose essays "the march of the whole is settled from the beginning, together with the divisions and articulations of the parts," Meredith composed with no settled plan in view, and that consequently "there is some lack of precision in the order and in matters of detail." The editor endeavors to extract "by force" a formal scheme by parts and subdivisions, but the resultant analysis is so complex as to do little more than darken counsel. The account in the London *Times* of the original lecture is reprinted, and shows that the lecture was subjected to considerable revision before its appearance in print. A list of variant readings between the original text which appeared in the *New Quarterly Magazine* in 1877 and the revised texts of 1897 and 1898 provides further proof of the care that Meredith expended upon minute details of his work. A convenient bibliography of the chief writers of comedy and the chief authorities, both scientific and popular, on comedy, laughter, and the like is appended. A single minute error in the Introduction—May 19, instead of May 18, 1909, as the date of Meredith's death—may be recorded.

THE reading public should welcome the "Library of French Fiction" which Messrs. Dutton and Company have lately undertaken. Representing works by contemporary French writers of all schools, the series will include novels dealing with life in the provinces as well as Paris. The editor, Mr. Barnet J. Beyer, purposes to make available for English readers a "human comedy" such as Balzac might have outlined. The collection will present, with the various types of her peoples, the manifold social life of France. This could hardly be said of the contemporary French fiction hitherto accessible. Chosen more or less at random, it too often either misrepresented a particular province or assumed that the boulevards represented all France. The Dutton enterprise, however, bears evidence of judicious selection. Thus far three volumes have appeared: "Jacquou the Rebel" by Eugène Le Roy, "Nono" by Gaston Roupnel, and "Two Banks of the Seine" by Fernand Vandérem. "Jacquou the Rebel," a story of rural life in Périgord, is a specimen of the author's best realism. Though not entirely free from political bias, it in the main reflects faithfully Périgord manners and social conditions. "Nono" depicts in masterly fashion life in the sunny vineyards of Burgundy. In "Two Banks of the Seine," with its setting in the Latin Quarter, Fernand Vandérem mingles agreeably realism and romance, irony and banter. All three novels are not only representative of French life, but are also works of high artistic merit. Moreover, the translations, with the exception of that of "Nono," which is occasionally too close to the French idiom, are so skilfully done that the novels might well pass for English originals. They augur well for those to follow in the series.

HENRY ROSENBERG, native of Switzerland and foremost benefactor of Galveston, his adopted home, is the subject of a handsome memorial volume issued by the Rosenberg Library of that city. In the years from 1843 to 1893 this man of conspicuous achievement in commerce and banking, and of charitable impulses that sought and found various means of tangible and permanently useful expression, became more and more a commanding figure in his community, serving as President of the Board of Harbor Improvements, building a public school, and otherwise contributing materially to the city's welfare. At his death he made generous provision, among other bequests, for the establishment of a public library, and the building was completed and dedicated eleven years later, having now been in rapidly growing use for nearly fifteen years. The book pays due tribute, in prose and verse, to the memory of the benefactor, and gives a detailed account of his many benefactions, with illustrations from photographs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

Le Coq d'Or and Roman Pantomime

THE career of "The Golden Cockerel," as it was sometimes called in London, is not unlike that of Hans Andersen's "Ugly Duckling." Written in 1907, it was condemned by the Russian censors, for they, perhaps with good reason, regarded it as an attack upon the powers that were; not till after Rimsky-Korsakoff's death did it appear upon the stage, at Moscow in 1909. The satiric drollery of the libretto, skilfully made by Bielsky from a poem of Pushkin, and the thoroughly original and exquisitely appropriate music must have received some recognition. Five years later the Golden Bird migrated, and Michael Fokine, the leader of Diaghileff's Ballet Russe, after clipping some of its exuberant plumage, introduced it to Paris. Its reception was most cordial. The rather tedious opera had now become a fascinating operatic pantomime: the ugly duckling was transformed into a lovely swan. But its sorrows were not yet over, for the widow and son of Rimsky-Korsakoff objected to the Gallic metamorphosis of their Russian chanticleer and so, by means of the copyright law, brought his sojourn in Paris to a speedy end. Straightway he flew across the Channel to Drury Lane. That was in the June of 1914; a little less than four years afterward he took the much longer flight across the Atlantic and now the inhabitants of the Metropolitan Opera House worship him almost as devoutly as did old King Dodon.

What Fokine did to the opera was to separate the action of the piece from the singing. Chorus and soloists, garbed all alike in dark reddish robes and hats, now sit on ever-narrowing tiers of seats at the sides of the stage, the central and by far the greater part of which, decked out in Willy Pogány's fantastic scenery, is given over to the "acting-dancers." These carry out in dumb show the story which the singers and orchestra are relating by means of words and music. By this division of labor the difficult music is more adequately rendered and the mimicry and dancing more elaborately and subtly developed than would be possible if the same artists were required to do both.

However, "Le Coq," as presented today, is not by any means unique; centuries ago exactly the same correlation of singing, acting, and orchestral accompaniment existed in the Roman Pantomime. The origin, too, of the Pantomime was like that of its modern congener, for it grew out of tragedy, and classical tragedy (and comedy also) was like opera in that certain portions, at least, were interpreted by means of song and dance. In 22 A. D. Pylades created Roman Pantomime by causing mythological tales to be sung by choruses and acted by trained mimics and dancers. In Latin the word *pantomimus* ("imitating everything") is always used of the actor, never of the performance.

There are many interesting peculiarities about Roman Pantomime; unfortunately the references in our ancient authorities are not so explicit and so complete as we could wish. The orchestra was composed of harps and flutes of different sizes and kinds; time was kept by means of a contrivance of two pieces of wood beaten together by the foot. The singing was done by a large chorus; we do not know whether this chorus was visible to the spectators, or where it was placed. The greatest difference between the Pantomime and the present "Coq d'Or" was that the modern piece is represented by many actors, whereas on the Roman stage all the characters were impersonated by a single artist. That is, to present "Le Coq" as a Roman Pantomime, it would be necessary for Adolph Bolm (not the supreme Rosina, for no woman was permitted to act in public pantomime until late in the Empire), to play King Dodon, the Astrologer, Amelfa, the Princess, and all the other parts, including the chorus! Occasionally, but very rarely, more than one *pantomimus* appeared in the same play, for Lucian tells of one actor who, in playing the part of the mad Ajax, lost himself in his part to such an extent that, snatching the flute from the hands of one of the musicians, he dealt a mighty blow upon the head of his fellow-actor who was playing Odysseus; fortunately Odysseus was preserved from immediate death by an unusually stout cap.

Naturally the *pantomimus* had to be an artist of remarkable powers, both physical and intellectual. His body had to be agile, supple, and strong, for like the Russian ballet, the Roman Pantomime called for sudden and repeated turnings, twistings, bendings, and leapings. The mental powers also required a most strenuous training; every movement, every gesture had to have its own special significance. Let those who today jeer at the art of Pavlowa and Nijinsky read how Demetrius the Cynic was converted from the same sin of artistic blasphemy. Here is the story, as given in F. G. Fowler's excellent translation of Lucian's dialogue on Pantomime:

"The leading pantomime of the day—this was in Nero's reign—was apparently a man of no mean intelligence; unsurpassed, in fact, in wideness of range and in grace of execution. Nothing, I think, could be more reasonable than the request he made of Demetrius, which was, to reserve his decision till he had witnessed his performance, which he undertook to go through without the assistance of flute or song. He was as good as his word. The time-beaters, the flutes, even the chorus, were ordered to preserve a strict silence; and the pantomime, left to his own resources, represented the loves of Ares and Aphrodite, the tell-tale Sun, the craft of Hephæstus, his capture of the two lovers in the net, the surrounding Gods, each in his turn, the blushes of Aphrodite, the embarrassment of Ares, his entreaties—in fact the whole story. Demetrius was ravished at the spectacle; nor could there be higher praise than that with which he rewarded the performer: 'Man,' he shrieked at the top of his voice, 'this is not seeing, but hearing and seeing, both; 'tis as if your hands were tongues!'"

A careful reader of this tale will come to the conclusion that convention must have played a large part in this pantomimic representation, i. e., that certain steps, gestures, and evolutions of the body came to have stereotyped significations. This we learn was actually the case; only the well-trained spectator could enjoy the representation to the full, for only he, like the modern devotee of symphony concerts, could grasp the meaning and beauty of the technical subtleties. Sometimes—and perhaps this not infrequently happens today—the artists themselves were less versed in the intricacies of their art than some of the spectators. Once a *pantomimus* who was enacting the story of the birth of Zeus, in which Cronus devours his own children, misled by the similarity of theme, represented the spectacle of Thyestes eating his sons. Another was supposed to be showing Semele, mother of Bacchus, consumed by the fire of the lightning stroke, but he chose the wrong "fire-dance" and gave the story of Creusa enveloped by the flames of the poisoned robe sent to her as a marriage gift by the deserted Medea.

Have we another parallel to "Le Coq" in "L'Amfiparnaso" of Orazio Vecchi, a work which was performed at Modena in 1594? It was just at this time, during the closing years of the sixteenth century, that in Florence a number of literary and musical spirits with lofty ideals were gathering every now and then at the house of Giovanni Bardi, Conte di Vernio. One of their aims was to revive Greek tragedy with its musical accompaniments, and Jacopo Peri produced as the result of his endeavors in this direction two works, the "Dafne" and the "Euridice." The latter obtained the honor of a public production in 1600, during the festivities which celebrated the marriage of Henri IV and Maria de Medici. These two musical plays, simple and crude as they seem today, are usually regarded as the beginnings of Italian opera.

Perhaps Vecchi intended to give these learned idealists a mildly satiric thrust with his "L'Amfiparnaso," for this enigmatic title, "The Slopes or Foothills of Parnassus," may be rendered in modern phraseology as "The *Near*-Parnassus." The author, in the prologue, speaks of his work as *di doppia novità composita*. One of these novelties, it is quite clear, is the introduction into a musical composition of those characters which were appearing during the sixteenth and seventeenth cen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turies at all the village fairs in northern Italy, the beloved "masks" of the *commedia dell' arte*. Vecchi, for his "Near-Parnassus," instead of Apollo and Daphne, Orpheus and Eurydice, chose as his characters Pantalone, the old Venetian merchant, *il dottor* Gratiano, a Mr. Malaprop from Bologna, the two Bergamask servants, Arlecchino the fool, and Brighella, the knave. Zane, another servant, is of the Arlecchino type and Pedrolino is a second Brighella.

Vecchi called his work a *commedia armonica*; it is a series of fourteen madrigals for five voices written in polyphonic style without any instrumental accompaniment. These songs are arranged in three acts, but they do not attempt to present a developed story; the love affair of Lucio and Isabella is a feeble thread on which the disconnected scenes are loosely strung. The music, aside from a few sentences at the opening of the first act, is written so that several or all the voices may be singing the words of a single character; this is inevitable, because the other voices take the place of an instrumental accompaniment for the soloists. Occasionally an exceedingly ludicrous effect results, as in Act II, scene 5, where Frulla, the servant of Pantalone, is trying to prevent Isabella from committing suicide. The two upper voices, representing Isabella, sing *Lasciami morire; farò si*, "Let me die; yes, I will!" The lower express the dissuading Frulla, *Non farai; depon giù l'armi*, "You shall not do it; put down now the weapons!" But the middle voice, supporting a dual rôle, sings all these words!

It is obvious that the singers could not have acted the parts they sang; did a company of mute actors appear on the stage to present to the eye what the singers were giving to the ear? If so, then "L'Amfiparnaso" belongs to the same artistic genre as Roman Pantomime and "Le Coq d'Or." For many years historians of music have held this belief. There were two facts especially which influenced them: the little woodcuts, representing a stage and actors with which the printed edition of "L'Amfiparnaso" was illustrated, and the "stage-directions" which Adriano Banchieri, a follower and imitator of Vecchi, inserted in his "Saviezza Giovenile." On the other hand, the prologue of "L'Amfiparnaso" clearly indicates that there is no scenery or action; the concluding words are especially convincing: "This play of which I speak, is observed with the mind, which it reaches through the ears, not through the eyes; therefore, let silence reign, and in place of seeing, now give ear." Therefore, the best of recent authorities—for example, Johannes Bolte, in his introduction to Eitner's edition, Romain Rolland, in his doctor's dissertation, "Les Origines du Théâtre Moderne," and E. J. Dent—maintain that "L'Amfiparnaso" was merely sung, not both sung and acted, like Roman Pantomime and "The Golden Cock."

Aesthetically considered, "Le Coq d'Or," as performed today, may not win the favor of those who refuse to derive enjoyment from a mixture of artistic delights. Wagner, as we all know, wished opera to be a union on equal terms of the poetic, plastic, and musical arts. Would he, in this case, have looked upon the exaltation of the terpsichorean element as merely a legitimate development of the plastic? John Palmer, in an article, "Gesture and Scenery in Modern Opera" (*The Musical Quarterly*, April, 1916) is especially severe on "Le Coq d'Or," merely because every one of its components is so nearly perfect that the attention is distracted now by the music, now by the acting, now by the scenery and costumes, so that it is quite impossible to enjoy the work as one harmonious whole. That is, this "choreographic drama with vocal obligato," as it was once called by a writer in the *Sun*, is something like a three-ringed circus. Mr. Palmer believes, however, that the arts should unite, but that always one should receive chief place and the others be subordinated. Granted that this be so, may we not claim that in the case of "The Golden Cock," one, in fact, is made preëminent, and the others simply serve to intensify its appeal? As to which of the arts, in this especial case, is the one so honored—let each one answer for himself; it is a problem like that of "The Lady or the Tiger."

HAROLD L. CLEASBY

Finance

Readjusting Commodity Prices

THE steel industry is being rapidly readjusted to a peace basis. The country's average pig-iron production in April fell to 82,607 tons per day, a falling off for the month of 17,078 tons. The official figures show that fifty-four furnaces blew out during the month, leaving active on May 1 212 furnaces, with a capacity of 75,860 tons a day, as compared with 266 furnaces in blast on April 1, with a capacity of 93,165 tons.

Taking these figures as a basis, the country's total pig-iron capacity, including charcoal iron, is now at the rate of 28,000,000 tons a year, as against 39,052,000 tons actually produced in 1918. Although pig-iron production in the United States is now at the lowest rate touched in three years, the industry is getting in a strong position technically and may be expected to give a good account of itself, as soon as more normal conditions prevail, through the inevitable readjustment governed by the law of supply and demand.

Export business is bound to enlarge as soon as adequate shipping facilities have been provided. Several large foreign orders have been recently given out, including one from Japan for 4,700 tons of structural shapes, another from Canada for 4,000 tons of plates, and a contract for 2,100 cars for France. The outlook for foreign business is excellent, and with the return about July 1 of a large tonnage of merchant ships taken over by the Government during the war period, it is fair to expect a much stronger inquiry from abroad. Owing to labor conditions in England, it is possible for American steel producers to do a large business with markets that are usually closed to them.

The probability is that the steel industry would have been better off if its readjustment to peace conditions had followed a natural course without Government interference. The failure of the Industrial Board to stabilize prices through the refusal of the Railroad Administration to release large buying orders at the prices first named, had a depressing effect upon all branches of industry. It kept large consumers from entering the market and held up business in other branches more or less directly related to the steel industry. It had also an important psychological effect upon business in general, and caused considerable unsettlement in quarters which had begun to adopt a more optimistic view. The probability is therefore that this episode in the steel trade will be referred to, for years to come, as offering a good example of the folly of ignoring natural laws in the industrial world. The situation is full of interesting possibilities, and it may be that a further effort will be made to revive the activities of the Industrial Board in the effort to expedite the readjustment of all industries to a peace basis.

It will be recalled, however, that various trade experts pointed out, at the time that the Industrial Board initiated its movement to stabilize prices, that the problem was not one for the Board to handle at all, since there were so many modifying conditions as to make it difficult for any commission to push the readjustment artificially. The problem was all the more involved, because of the sensational advance in prices that had taken place in response to war conditions, and the effort of the Federal authorities to expedite all Government work. Under these conditions of "rush orders," it was inevitable that prices should have advanced in a sensational way. As it is, the position of various industries has been somewhat strengthened by the forced reduction in prices due to the return to peace conditions.

The readjustment process in various lines is likely to be expedited now that a peace compact has been formulated, as the nations involved in the great war will be forced to return to peaceful pursuits. The position for all industry has also been changed to some extent by the new influences set in motion by the completion of the chief work of the Paris Conference.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Canby, Henry S. Education by Violence. Macmillan. $1.50.
Friedlaender, I. Past and Present. Cincinnati: Ark Publishing Co.
Jastrow, Morris. A Gentle Cynic. Lippincott. $2.
Jones, Richard F. Lewis Theobald. Columbia Press. $2.
Mordell, Albert. The Erotic Motive in Literature. Boni & Liveright. $1.75.
Newbolt, Henry. A New Study of English Poetry. Dutton. $3.
Packard, Maurice. Shylock Not a Jew. Boston: Stratford Co. 75 cents.
Sawyer, Roland D. Walt Whitman. Boston: Four Seas.
Sumner, William G. The Forgotten Man, and Other Essays. Yale Press. $2.50.
Symonds, John A. Last and First. New York: N. L. Brown. $1.50.
Van Doren, Carl, editor. Tales by Washington Irving. Oxford Press. $1.60.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Barrie. J. M. Alice Sit-by-the-Fire. Scribners. $1.
Gould, Felix. The Marsh Maiden. Boston: Four Seas.
O'Neill, Eugene G. The Moon of the Caribbees. Boni & Liveright. $1.35.
Robinson, Corinne R. Service and Sacrifice. Scribners. $1.25.
Trask, Katrina. Without the Walls. Macmillan. $1.40.
Wood, Clement. The Earth Turns South. Dutton. $1.50.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Cunningham, Joseph D. A History of the Sikhs. Edited by H. L. O. Garrett. Oxford Press. $3.85.
Czaplicka, M. A. The Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day. Oxford Press. $3.40.
Davidson, Gordon C. The North West Company. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Higby, Chester P. The Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government During the Napoleonic Period. Longmans, Green.
Marvin, F. S. The Century of Hope. Oxford Press. $3.
Osborn, E. B. The New Elizabethans. Lane. $4.
Sharpless, Isaac. Political Leaders of Provincial Pennsylvania. Macmillan. $2.50.

FICTION

Brodie-Innes, J. W. The Golden Rope. Lane. $1.40.
Dodge, Louis. Rosy. Scribners. $1.60.
Guthrie, Kenneth S. A Romance of Two Centuries. Alpine, N. J.: Platonist Press. $1.65.
Hodges, Arthur. The Bounder. Houghton Mifflin. $1.60.
Huard, Frances W. Lilies, White and Red. Doran. $1.50.
James, Henry. Travelling Companions. Boni & Liveright. $1.75.
Lancaster, Hewes. The Wind in the Garden. Boston: Stratford Co. $1.25.
Maher, Richard A. The Hills of Desire. Macmillan. $1.50.
Rees. Arthur J. The Shrieking Pit. Lane. $1.50.
Régamey, Jeanne. Celle Qui Dormait. Paris: E. Sansot.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Andrews, Irene O. Economic Effects of the War upon Women and Children in Great Britain. Oxford Press. $1.
Brissenden, Paul F. The I. W. W.: A Study of American Syndicalism. Longmans, Green.
Chung, Henry, compiler. Korean Treaties. New York: H. S. Nichols. $3.
De Ayala, Ramón P. Política y Toros. Madrid: Calleja.
Edgeworth, F. Y. A Levy on Capital for the Discharge of Debt. Oxford Press. 45 cents.
Gephart, William F. Effects of the War upon Insurance. Oxford University Press. $1.
Harris, Garrard. The Redemption of the Disabled. Appleton. $2.
Hollander, Jacob H. War Borrowing. Macmillan. $1.50.
Laski, Harold J. Authority in the Modern State. Yale Press. $3.
Laughlin, J. Laurence. Money and Prices. Scribners. $2.50.
Lippincott, Isaac. Problems of Reconstruction. Macmillan. $1.60.
Lippmann, Walter. The Political Scene. Holt. $1.
McVey, Frank L. The Financial History of Great Britain. Oxford Press. $1.
Moody, Walter D. What of the City? Chicago: McClurg. $2.50.
Russell, Charles E. After the Whirlwind. Doran. $1.50.
Smith-Gordon, Lionel, and Staples, Laurence C. Rural Reconstruction in Ireland. Yale Press. $3.
Spargo, John. Bolshevism. Harpers. $1.50.
Wilson, Woodrow. International Ideals. Harpers. $1.

THE WAR

Anonymous. The Curtain of Steel. Doran. $1.50.
Blankenhorn, Heber. Adventures in Propaganda. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50.
Cable, Boyd. Air Men o'War. Dutton. $1.75.
Finley, John. A Pilgrim in Palestine. Scribners. $2.
Rouges, Jean des Vignes. Bourru, Soldier of France. Dutton. $1.90.
West, William B. The Fight for the Argonne. Abingdon Press. 75 cents.

MISCELLANEOUS

Chapman, Charles E. Catalogue of Materials in the Archivo General de Indias. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Dellinger, J. H., and others. The Principles Underlying Radio Communication. Washington: Government Printing Office.
Willoughby, L. A., editor. Von dem Jungesten Tage. Oxford Press. $3.40.

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

"*Architecture and Democracy*"

By Claude Bragdon

"Both in his designing and in his writing he manifests art in its most exquisite form. An altogether delightful book; should be read thoughtfully by everyone who loves beauty. It is good for the soul of any person to be brought face to face with the great thoughts and the profound truths contained therein. . . . Numerous and remarkable illustrations."—*Rochester Democrat Chronicle.*

$2.00 *net at all bookshops.*

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 West Forty-second Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIX HOUR DAY and OTHER INDUSTRIAL QUESTIONS

By Lord Leverhulme

Lord Leverhulme has made actual experiments with the six-hour day, profit-sharing, schemes, etc., in his own great industrial enterprises, and advocates them, not as a visionary, but as the head of a great business concern with an eye turned toward the future of production, and the mental, moral, and physical welfare of the workers. ($3.50 net.)

A German view of the League—

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By Mathias Erzberger

Herr Erzberger takes up such questions as Germany and the World's Peace, Compulsory Arbitration, Disarmament, Freedom of International Trade, Colonial Problems, Composition and Executive Means of the League, and a German View of what the Constitution should be. ($2.25 net.)

CRIME AND CRIMINALS

By Charles Mercier, M.D.

"The most sensible book that has yet been written on this particular subject."—*London Times.* ($2.50 net.)

A juvenile for these times—

REBELS AND REFORMERS

By A. and D. Ponsonby

This is the first book to bring within the reach of younger readers the lives of such notable figures as Savonarola, Bruno, Voltaire, Mazzini, William Lloyd Garrison, and Thoreau—men who dared think and act for themselves. (Illustrated, $1.60 net.)

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St. New York

THE WONDERS OF THE HUMAN BODY

The days of speculative philosophy have ended. Recognizing, at last, the significance of the ancient command, "Man, know thyself," we demand facts. The wonders of the human organism and the actual chemical process of physical regeneration are facts, which are clearly and concisely set forth in this most marvelous book. *Price,* $1.50

THE CHEMISTRY OF HUMAN LIFE

A complete statement of the Chemistry of Life operating in the human organism.

The chemical formula of each of the twelve cell-salts and their pathological action are given in plain and simple terms.

The wisdom of the ages along the lines leading to physical perfection, in material expression, is in this wonder-book, concentrated and made understandable to the average reader. *Price,* $1.00

Address: Dr. GEORGE W. CAREY

P. O. Box 293 Los Angeles, Cal.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him and The Nation.

For Independent Liberal and Labour Opinion in England read

COMMON SENSE

Edited by F. W. HIRST

Published every Saturday

Subscription rate 3 dollars a year post paid. Subscription may be sent c/o The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. or direct to The Manager, 44, Essex Street, London, W.C.2.

Send a card for a free specimen copy.

The World Tomorrow

is a venture in free and unfettered journalism which seeks to discover and tell the truth about the manifold tyrannies of our political and economic system and to point the way to a new world of freedom and fellowship. It needs the co-operation of a growing body of interested readers. Will you be one of them? If so, send us your name and address and $1 for twelve monthly issues to

The World Tomorrow

118 East 28th Street New York City

¶ *Be sure to begin with the June issue which will contain Oswald Garrison Villard's story of Germany in collapse*

The Modern School

A Monthly Magazine of Libertarian Education

Walt Whitman Number

Original contributions from Whitman, Harned, Traubel, Burroughs, Ananda Coomaraswamy, Padraic Colum, J. W. Wallace, Leonard D. Abbott and many others. Original views and pictures.

APRIL-MAY NUMBER TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

The Modern School STELTON, N. J.

FIFTEEN CENTS A COPY :: :: ONE DOLLAR AND A HALF A YEAR

Koosy-oonek

(ask an Eskimo) will not be able to work his black magic on your camping trip this summer if you plan it with the aid of the Harvard Travellers Club "Handbook of Travel." Leading sportsmen and explorers of America here present the results of their years on mountain trails. You need the book in your library and in your knapsack. The price is $2.50. *Inquire at your dealer's.*

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

29 Randall Hall, Cambridge Mass.
280 Madison Ave., New York City

Longman's New Books

History of Zionism, 1600-1918

By Nahum Sokolow. With an Introduction by the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., and Letters to the Author from the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce and Colonel Sir Mark Sykes, Bart., M.P. With 89 Portraits and Illustrations Selected and Arranged by Israel Solomons. In Two Volumes. 8vo. Vol. I, $7.50 net. Vol. I ready. Vol. II ready in May.

In this work an attempt is made to deal with a considerable portion of the history of Zionism that has hitherto been very imperfectly explored, namely, the origin and development of the Zionist idea principally in England, and partly in France, during the last centuries, among Gentiles and Jews.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH St., N. Y.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY *of* CALIFORNIA

Monographs and separates in Sciences, Economics, History, Philology, Philosophy, etc.

List of titles and prices free on request.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

THE MODERN LIBRARY

OF THE WORLD'S BEST BOOKS

Sixty-four titles now published.

Only 70c. a volume. Catalogue on request.

BONI & LIVERIGHT, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1919 No. 2811

The Productivity of Russian Labor*

By A. LOMOV

EXACTLY a year has passed since the proletariat, by violent effort, wrung the power out of the hands of the bourgeoisie. The nationalization of the banks, the nationalization of industry, the regulation of the process of distribution, the transition of industry to a peace basis—all these reforms have radically changed the whole structure of national economy. In what way have these reforms reacted upon the general economic conditions of the country? Have they increased the national welfare, or have they made it worse? The bourgeoisie and its "socialistic" satellites in resolute chorus reply: The Soviet authority by its wild reforms has destroyed industry; that is why the productivity of labor has fallen catastrophically and continues to fall. The economic programme of the Soviet Government has failed. There is but one escape from this difficulty; it is necessary to call forth anew the bourgeois spirit and turn over to it the control of production. Not so does the proletarian view the situation. He continues unequivocally to carry out his plan of economic reorganization of the whole system of bourgeois economy on the basis of establishing a proletarian dictatorship, and insists that the economic programme of communism has proven itself vital and correct. Which is right?

Let us attempt to give our answer on the basis of an analysis of the material facts regarding the productivity of labor.

In order to avoid a series of pathetic misunderstandings, we must make a few preliminary remarks. In the literature of recent days, two conceptions are very often confused—the productivity of labor and its intensity. Obviously, however, there exists a wide difference between these two conceptions. The productivity of labor, *i.e.*, its ability in a certain time to produce this or that quantity of goods, depends not only upon the worker's skill and application, but also upon the means or tools of production that are at his disposal. Accordingly, in the process of increasing the productivity of labor, tremendous significance must be attached to the condition of the means or tools of production and to the correct, constant, and sufficient supply of raw materials and fuel.

In this respect, all the districts of Russia, thanks to the war and to the internal disorganization of the mechanism of exchange, were not able to repair and renew their equipment. The impossibility of obtaining new machinery makes necessary the continuance of work in the factories with old, worn machines, the inability to acquire new parts for which results in the substitution of parts which only approximately fit. All this greatly disarranged the process of production. The lack of raw materials and fuel, particularly after the occupation of the Donetz Basin by German and Ukrainian troops, has in a considerable measure aggravated this industrial ruin. Under such conditions the productivity of labor could not but decrease.

Simultaneously with this, and in the same direction, there was going on the rapid demobilization of factories—the transition of production from a war basis to a peace basis, which the Soviet Government had to carry out without previous preparations immediately after the capture by it of political power. But even under normal conditions a gradual transition from one kind of production to another is followed by a period of disarrangement, of adaptation to the changing conditions; it ordinarily is connected with the receipt of new kinds of raw material, at times of fuel, and, in particular, with the receipt of new machinery and tools of production. Under conditions, however, of almost inconceivable world economic exhaustion, with an almost complete cessation of foreign trade and an immense decrease of internal exchange, the situation was becoming worse and worse. If we add to this the acute lack of means for obtaining raw material and fuel and for the payment of labor, it becomes clear that for the proletariat to organize and carry on production under such conditions was a problem of the greatest difficulty and perplexity.

The reports and statistics from all factories—the Ural section (Slato-Ustovsky district), the Petrovsky factories (southern Russia), Makeefka (the Donetz Basin), Sormovsky, Colomensky, the Kulebaksky factories, the Beloretzky factories, the Petrograd factories, and a whole series of others—all point to the lack of fuel, to attempts (with the exception of the Petrovsky and the Makeefka sections) at the adoption of new kinds of fuel in connection with the transition, and to the lack of a whole series of parts and raw materials. The Westinghouse factory has little fuel, there is a lack of several necessary parts and an acute lack of raw materials; the Beloretzky factories have no acids and no fire stones; the Bejetzky car-building factories have no squares or metals; the Colomensky works receive raw materials very irregularly; there is an absence of superheaters and smoke boxes; the delay in the supply from Viksunsky and Southern factories of the necessary raw materials has gravely affected the development of the locomotive industry. Under such conditions the Colomensky factory, having completed the construction of a series of locomotives, is unable to deliver them to the railways from lack of super-heaters.

Circumstances often present difficult peculiarities; for example, a whole series of factories and mills are often incapable of putting out their full production because of the congestion of their storehouses. This is to be seen in a large number of cement mills (the Volskyie mills); a large number of textile, match, and rubber factories have also complained of the congestion of their storehouses; the same complaint is often made even by our car and locomotive works. The spokesman of the Colomensky factory, at the

*This article originally appeared as a chapter in a volume by various writers, published at Moscow in December, 1918, and comprising an official review of the administrative and economic activities of the Soviet Government down to that time. The author, who is attached to the People's Commissariat of Industry, is well known in Russia as a writer on industrial and economic subjects. The article has been somewhat condensed, and a number of corrections in the official English translation have been made. For permission to reprint the article the *Nation* is indebted to the Bureau of the Representative in the United States of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

May factory conference of mills supplying railroad equipment, brought out the following data: "The output of cars is delayed by the fact that there is no place in which to put away the finished product. . . . At the factory, cars stand in large numbers over the whole factory area; there are now ready about seventy cisterns and thirty-five locomotives." Financial difficulties have been and are being experienced by almost all factories. If delays in the payment of the fortnightly wages which took place at the Colomensky factory, according to the evidence of the above speaker, have already caused much concern to the masses of workers and have greatly influenced the whole productive process, how much influence must the non-payment of wages for a period of two months (the Viksunsky factory), or the regular payment of only one-third of the wages (the Beloretzky factories) have produced?

The reports of the managements of the nationalized Petrovsky and Makeefka factories clearly emphasize this point. The management of the Petrovsky factories formulates its opinion on the question in the following words: "The management, together with the factory committee, has from the very beginning considered it its duty to increase the productivity of the factory, but all our endeavors in this direction could not be realized because of the lack of funds; to increase the productivity of the factory, accordingly, appeared impossible." In spite of the seeming simplicity of this position, many comrades, not to speak of the bourgeois economists, do not want to take it into consideration; yet it is a fact that all factories either systematically or at times are suffering from great financial difficulties which seriously hamper the productive process. At the present time, however, the financial difficulties have been to a greater or lesser degree removed or lessened.

No less an influence on the productive process is exercised by the food supply. The Russian worker who, until the war, was accustomed to the consumption of an unlimited quantity of bread, cannot exist upon an eighth or a quarter of a pound of bread; yet, judging from reports and information, he cannot always count even on this modest ration. The worker everywhere was occupied not only with factory work, but also with the food problem. At times a whole factory (Viksa), brought by the lack of bread to the last extremity, mobilizes and sends out detachments armed with machine guns to obtain bread. It is needless to say that a starving or half-starved worker is in general a poor worker; but besides this the insufficient and irregular bread supply breaks the continuity and organization of the productive process by causing mass idleness—a condition which continued to involve more and more people in a series of factories of the central district. The food supply, according to the testimony of the spokesman of the Colomensky factory, Engineer Satelli, is "one of the main causes" of the fall in the productivity of labor. "The food supply in our factory may destroy everything," tragically ends the report of the representative of the Westinghouse factory. Similar information comes also from other factories.

At the present time, when we are successfully gathering the new harvest and are introducing everywhere the class ration, the situation may be regarded as considerably improved. The effect will be noticed in the factory work of the next few months. We do not mention the influence of the civil war upon the productive process at Makeefka, for instance, which was twice occupied by Kaledine's Cossacks and the Ukrainians, and is now held by the Germans. The same thing has also happened to the Petrovsky factories.

Ordinarily, when the greatest decrease in the productivity of factories is sought to be proved, it is done in an extremely simple manner: either figures are taken for the first quarter of the last pre-revolutionary years and compared with the corresponding figures of the present year, or else it is done even more simply by merely taking the figures for November and December in a series of recent years. The result is always the same; a colossal decrease of productivity is shown, and from that the inference is drawn of the immediately forthcoming catastrophe. What is necessary is to compare the figures of the nearest months following the change, one after another, in order to discover whether we have to deal with a decrease in the productivity of labor as a permanent phenomenon under the present changed social structure, or whether it is merely a temporary condition. On the basis of this latter method, we now submit some figures. We begin with the factories of the central districts.

In a report read at the conference of machine-construction factories, held at Moscow, May 14-22, 1918, the representative of the Colomensky factory, Engineer Satelli, pointing to the decrease in the productivity of labor in comparison with former years, submitted amongst other things the following figures:

1918	Cast-steel industry		Cast-iron industry		Steam-forging industry	
	Poods	Per cent of increase or decrease	Poods	Per cent of increase or decrease	Poods	Per cent of increase or decrease
January	7,459	..	7,291	..	8,674	..
February	16,041	+115	11,006	+50	9,009	+ 4
March	17,385	+8	12,213	+12	10,456	+16
April	20,184	+16	16,857	+37	16,000	+53

1918	Car-forging industry		Hydraulic-press industry	
	Poods	Per cent of increase or decrease	Poods	Per cent of increase or decrease
January	9,012	..	4,086	..
February	6,911	—23	6,372	+55
March	7,981	+10	6,383	+0
April	6,832	—10	5,740	—10

It will be seen that, in spite of extremely unfavorable economic conditions, the productivity of labor had already begun to increase at the beginning of 1918 in a number of industries. What is more, the increase is not slight but very rapid and strikingly marked. In the cast-steel industry the increase in April, as compared with January, was 170 per cent.; in the cast-iron industry, 131 per cent.; in the hydraulic-press industry, 40 per cent.; and only in car forging has it fallen 24 per cent., and there on account of causes of an external character. January is the worst month; thereafter begins a rapid advance. These results have been exclusively the fruits of the self-reliance of the proletarian class. Piece wages were firmly introduced by a special wage-fixing commission, consisting of representatives of the professional unions and the technical personnel, which, "very energetically," as the spokesman said, undertook its task.

Similar data come from other districts. In the Petrograd Westinghouse factory, after the transition to piece wages and the establishment of a norm of output according to scale, the results showed themselves remarkably soon. In the smelting industry the report shows the following figures for 1918:

In January there were produced	3,000 Poods
In February	3,400 Poods
In March	3,886 Poods
In April	4,000 Poods

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even at the Baltic factory, where the wages are lower than at the factories of Moscow, Petrograd, and a number of provincial cities, "it was proven in the month of April that the workers, in the matter of productivity," as the spokesman, Comrade Chromov, indicated at the conference, "have made much more, almost twice as much as in March, and we suppose that in the future, with an increase in wages [up to the normal—the wage-scale had not yet been introduced into that factory], the productivity would rise even higher." Analagous information is given by the comrades from the evacuated "Phoenix" factory at Ribinsk, which in December, 1917, had an output of sixty-two cars, in January of forty, in February of eighteen, and in March and April of thirty-eight. The comrades note the great work done in this sphere by the factory committees. Similar information comes from the Hartmann factory at Lugansk, where the workers' committee has succeeded in turning out thirteen locomotives instead of three which were turned out in the fall. The comrades—members of the committees of the much-suffering Pietrovsky Soviet factories and Makeefka (mining and metallurgical "Union") draw the same pictures for their establishments. At the Pietrovsky factory, after its nationalization and the granting of the first sums for the payment of wages, the productivity of labor began to grow, and towards the end of April went up 30-40 per cent. In Makeefka, the daily output of coal from the mines from March to the middle of April alone went up from 60,000 poods to 92,000, or over 50 per cent.

More detailed information is available for the Zlatoustovsky district. Altogether there were produced in the district in 1918, in poods:

Pig-iron production:	January	February	March
Remade pig-iron.....	343,962.32	173,885.00	351,040.01
Cast pig-iron	37,854.00	21,277.00	41,354.00
Crude iron	18,724.08	8,285.30	17,125.39
Martenovsky production:			
Martens bars	.....	22,460.00	147,134.00
Puddling furnace:			
Moulds	37,401.00	19,180.00	29,095.00
Casting production: Pig-iron castings:			
High furnace production	541.00	332.29	1,367.10
Cupola furnace production	25,099.05	11,740.16	26,147.13
Steel founding paste.....	.....	332.33	1,726.29
Copper founding paste...	803.01	85.25	331.38
Various alloyage paste..	2,085.00	960.00	1,207.00
Rolling production: large sized production, Martens iron, pressed iron, Martens steel, crucible steel	61,947.00	35,916.82	48,192.79
Middle-sort production: Martens square iron, Martens steel, crucible steel, tilted East steel, moulded or stamped steel	49,800.16	25,581.88	38,331.08
Projectiles: various instruments in pieces, including intrenching [tools]	147,028.00	102,359.00	149,264.00
Ammunition, swords, daggers, etc.	4,107.00	2,889.00	7,460.00
Hand-made products, machine construction industry	299.00	.....	218.11

The sharp decrease in output during February shown in the above table, is explained by the transition from the old Russian calendar to the new calendar, thanks to which the number of days in February was reduced to fifteen.

The figures of the production of labor at the Ural Katav-Ivanovsky factory tell the same story.

	Casting of pig-iron (poods)	Average daily output (poods)
January	125,872	4,723
February (15 days)....	71,919	4,794
March	144,833	4,761
April	145,454	5,008

It is interesting to compare the figures of the productivity of labor of a factory with the figures of the three and one-half months of 1918.

The Production of a Factory

	Pig-iron	Bars	Fire-stone	Moulding of steel	Moulding of pig-iron
	Poods	Poods	Pieces	Poods	Poods
1915	1,938,682	182,060	167,434	....	21,475
1916	2,011,222	606,403	333,025	2,325	35,217
1917	1,868,041	570,272	352,173	8,347	40,580
4 mos. of 1918 (February 15 days)	488,078	196,213	108,741	3,504	11,132

These figures show that although the quantity of moulded pig-iron has decreased in comparison with the best year, 1916, still for the first three and one-half months of 1918 there was moulded about one-fourth of the amount of pig-iron turned out for the whole of 1916. As regards bars, founded pig-iron, and the production of fire stones, for the three and one-half months of 1918 there was put out about one-third of the entire production of 1916. As regards founded steel, for the first three and one-half months of 1918 the total amount of mouldings in poods exceeded by 50 per cent. the amount of mouldings for the whole of 1916. Furthermore, in spite of the acute insufficiency of the food supply, the productivity of labor evidently continued to increase. The productivity of the Petrograd metal works, for example, is shown by the following figures: the production in a number of branches for July was 70,000 poods, for August, 13,000; at the Equal factory the production increased 100-150 per cent.; at the Spiegal factory, 150-200 per cent.; at the Lesner factory, from August to September, 65 per cent.; at the Nevsky tobacco factory the average monthly output for the first half of 1918 was 2,448 poods, for July 5,180 poods; at the Luberetzky factory, Moscow, the productivity of labor has reached almost the pre-war standard.

Nevertheless, we cannot as yet dream of a production equal to that of peace times. The lack of raw materials and fuel, the acute hunger, the deterioration of the machinery, could not but delay the process of the rehabilitation of industry. Yet at this writing, several factories are either approaching or have already attained the peace-time norm. To the number of such factories belongs, for instance, the famous nationalized Simons-Schuckert factory. Let us examine in somewhat greater detail the work of this factory as a characteristic example of the rehabilitation of our whole industry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The February revolution and Kerenskyism left the factory in a condition of slow disintegration. Down to the time of the October revolution, its production fell to about one-third or one-fourth of what it was before, and the intensity of labor "decreased almost one-half." At the beginning of 1918 a definite change showed itself in the mood of the workers, who recognized the necessity of introducing strict labor discipline and who were ready and willing to have the piece-wage established. At the same time the administration of the establishment undertook the planning and gradual realization of a project of technical reorganization of the factory production; the factory committee at the same time selecting the best methods of introducing labor discipline and propagating the idea of the necessity of the latter amongst the masses of the workers. In the spring of the present year there was organized a mixed committee of representatives of the administration and workers' organizations, which worked out rules for the internal factory management which were later confirmed by a general meeting of the workers and the administration of the establishment. The practical introduction of labor disciplinary rules, which in the main correspond to labor laws, having for its purpose the introduction of the piece-wage, required a certain time for preliminary work and the improvement of the technical equipment of the shops; but during June, July, and August these problems were in a greater or lesser degree solved, and the factory now works entirely on the basis of piece-wage scales.

The introduction of piece work was preceded by serious doubts on the part of the workers as well as of the administration, due to the fear that at the beginning the wages of piece workers would prove insufficient in consequence of the general disintegration of production, and also to the fact that the workers themselves had lost the habit of more intensive labor. The workers greatly doubted the success of the enterprise, particularly on account of their physical exhaustion as a result of poor nutrition; it seemed that the general desire to establish the piece-wage system was threatened by no small dangers. It was decided that at the beginning, approximately for three months, the rules of labor discipline should be applied with the necessary laxity, and that to the wage scales there should be added, in case of necessity, prepayments to individual workers in cases where the price-fixing commission should find that the failure to produce the output required was not a result of negligence or lack of skill on the part of the worker himself, but of the general decline of efficiency in production. Eventually, however, these fears proved to be much exaggerated, and the output of the workers turned out to be entirely satisfactory, so much so that the above-mentioned correctives had to be applied only in rare cases.

In establishing new wage scales, the latter were increased, in comparison with the rates of 1914, proportionately to the average exchange, with an additional 25 per cent. on account of the shortening of the working day from ten to eight hours, 25 per cent. on account of the decrease of labor efficiency as a result of poor nutrition, and from 1 to 10 per cent. on account of a somewhat lowered norm, which was accepted for an average daily output in 1914. Thus the accepted increase in piece wages for regular work, to which most work belongs, showed itself, as regards the hourly output, in an increase of 60 per cent., and as regards the daily output, 35 per cent. A part of the work, having no direct precedents in 1914, was valued anew in accordance with the experience of the daily output. The result shows that the average weekly pay of piece workers has exceeded the daily pay by 30-160 per cent., an average of about 80 per cent. In other words, the average output of workers during the eight-hour working day is now about equal to that of 1910 during a ten-hour working day.

It is necessary to note the psychological as well as the economic significance for the workers of the nationalization of industry. From the moment of the transfer of industries into the hands of the Soviet Government, the worker no longer labors for the benefit of a capitalist but for that of the whole republic of proletarians and poor peasants. If, until nationalization, the worker could not have sufficient incentive to increase the intensity of labor, to manifest particular efficiency, from the moment of workers' control everything changes radically. Upon the worker now depends the finding of raw materials and fuel, the obtaining of orders, the delivery of the products, the financing of production, and the payment of the workers. The deep significance of the October revolution, as prompted by the class feeling of the workers, lies in nationalization, which is passing into socialization, of the whole industry.

The League of Nations in Danger

THE following sermon, preached by the Rt. Rev. Charles Gore, Bishop of Oxford, at St. Michael's Church, London, on March 26, is reprinted from the *Christian Commonwealth* (London) of April 2. On March 28 Bishop Gore's letter, dated March 15, resigning his bishopric, was made public.

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.—Isaiah lii. 7.

So we felt amidst the terrors of the great war; so it was that the proclamation of the idea of the League of Nations fell like a sort of pleasant dew upon the imagination of the common man. The idea is part of the reaction which of late years has prevailed in all directions, in all departments of human life, against the individualism which was rampant and dominant when I was a boy. In those remote days it was the accepted dogma that unrestricted competition among individuals or groups, enlightened by education and equipped by science, was to liberate humanity and bring us to the Golden Age. And then we found that we had been utterly deceived; we found this out long before the war. In the industrial world we found that this unrestricted competition which had been described as the setting of man free was really the enslaving of the masses of men. It led to vast fortunes for the few, but for the mass of men to a condition which, if not penury, at any rate was a condition of economic enslavement to forces which they could in no wise control. So that there had set in an almost universal reaction.

And it was exactly the same principle which had been at the root of the dominant idea of the balance of power, and the arming of all nations up to the highest point of military equipment; because selfishness is exactly the same principle, whether it be the selfishness of the individual or what the French call the selfishness *à deux à trois*, the selfishness of the family, or the selfishness of the class, or the selfishness of the nation. And national selfishness had led to a condition of things which was obviously threatening the very foundations of human civilization, in which each nation spent its resources in arming itself, using all the resources of science for the purposes of human destruction, restrained only by a balance of power which simply waited until one nation thought it had the opportunity of asserting itself. So it was that we were, and felt ourselves to be, on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eve of the great war; and then that terrible calamity fell upon us. Men saw no salvation for our civilization except the reorganizing of nations on some such system as should recognize that the interest of the whole body must be supreme over the interest of a particular class and particular individuals. So among the nations there must be some international alliance of all civilized peoples, which shall result in the production of a supernational authority, in which shall be embodied the common interest of human civilization, and which shall be dominant over any such selfish aggressor as Germany had just shown herself to be. And this alliance must exist, not for the destruction of liberty, but as the sole means of its maintenance; not for the destruction of the independence of nations, but because in no other way could nations really see a hope of maintaining themselves and being their true selves, and escaping the domination of any more powerful neighbor.

Now, this is idealistic. It strikes a great moral note. The great prophet of this doctrine was the greatest of all the prophets of modern democracy, that is, Joseph Mazzini. He was a passionate patriot, but always told his Italians that they must first of all vindicate their liberties as a nation before they could do anything for humanity, and must be ready to fight for their nation. But he had always seen that nationalism is only a step on the way to that higher thing which is the welfare of mankind, which must be throned above the interest of separate nations. That is idealism. It strikes a great moral note, and you know how all the traditions of the old industrial and political world are opposed to a moral note being struck. According to them "business is business" and "politics is politics." So it was that the cynics had an easy time. But what has disquieted the cynics is that it is not the people who would be called idealists, not the poets, the clergymen, the normal preachers of idealism, who are putting out this scheme of the League of Nations, but the practical men. There is no one with a knowledge of European politics to rival Lord Grey, and yet Lord Grey said this was not only a good scheme, but the one necessary scheme in which alone he saw the hope of salvation for our civilization. It was Balfour, notoriously skeptical of idealistic schemes, who told us in the same way it was necessary; it was the man with the legal mind, Asquith, who told us the same thing; it was Lord Robert Cecil, it was General Smuts; not people identified with idealism, but the practical men, and men of all kinds in politics. In America, if the President became the prophet of the League of Nations, yet his chief political opponent, ex-President Taft, maintained it first. And why? Why are they striking this high note? They all told us they saw no other way for the salvation of our civilization. They said that if after the war the representatives of the nations, though they might have established never so sound a peace and drawn never so cleverly the boundaries of a new Europe, were to separate and withdraw from that momentous council chamber, and go back to their homes leaving the nations on their old basis of individualistic organization, after a period of exhaustion to begin to build up again forces one against the other, using all the resources of science, now infinitely multiplied and developed in acuteness, for the production of instruments and means of destruction, to wait only till the spark should fall upon the tinder, literally they did not see how our civilization could survive.

Hilaire Belloc, whose prophecies have not always been fulfilled, ventured on a prophecy which so far has looked horribly like the truth. Please God the omen will not be fulfilled, but in a very clever article, written as in retrospect from the year 3000 A. D. out of a supposed just-recovering civilization, looking back upon the dark age of total barbarism which had followed the extinction of our race after the great war, he described how the scattered fragments of information which had been retained through the destruction of that civilization intimated what had happened. That is to say, that after the great war the nations had broken out into social strife and civil war between capital and labor; that meanwhile, in their anxiety to hurry home, the deputies of the nations had made a peace which seemed satisfactory for the moment, but which had left no security for the organization of a supernational authority. That is, they had got preoccupied with their domestic strife; meanwhile the period of exhaustion was over and another period of conflict, originating from another quarter, had broken out, and Europe was again at war. In its strained and dazed condition this had proved the harbinger of a universal chaos in which the slowly built up fabric of civilization had dissolved.

Well, you know, we read in past history of the dissolution of great and mighty civilizations, and we trace the causes coldly as we deal with things which do not touch ourselves; but as to our own civilization ranking among those giant forms of empire on their way to ruin, we do not like it. And yet the picture had a horrible verisimilitude, it coincided with this terrific threat of those somewhat big-minded men who told us that apart from the League of Nations they saw no other way to save our civilization. So, then, we were very thankful when the statesmen, immediately after the armistice, began to busy themselves about the League of Nations, and it came to be so much an accepted dogma that the peace was to be built upon the League of Nations and that the President of the United States was to be its prophet, that there were many people who leaped from skepticism to enthusiasm, and said it was no longer necessary to say anything about it because it could be taken for granted.

And now, where do we stand? Was there ever a moment in the war in which thoughtful men found themselves filled with a profounder anxiety than at this particular moment? And why? Because since the armistice was struck we seem to have looked in vain among the nations of the world for any better spirit than that of the old national individualism. A great many of us knew that it was idle to talk, as men did talk in the war, as if the spirit of aggressiveness was limited to Germany. We had read the secret treaties, and we knew what they meant. The secret treaties have not been disowned, but are still effective; and I ask you, cast your eye over the nations, where do you see a spirit larger than the old selfish spirit of claiming as much as you can get? Out of the spirit of claiming as much as you can get there can arise nothing except the universal scramble.

Or, once again, it seemed to me, when Germany had been thoroughly defeated, then was the moment to prove to Germany that it would be humanely treated; that it would be given a fair place for recovery. In the nature of things we did not ask for public repudiations; they would have been untrustworthy indeed. What we trusted was that Germany would be forced by the logic of events to realize, as indeed she must realize now, that she had been grossly, utterly, lamentably misled. What was wanted was surely a witness that if she behaved herself she would be allowed to re-enter the comity of nations uncrushed. You know what has happened. It is hard to resist the impression, however you distribute the blame, that the League of Nations is in the greatest peril of becoming an organization of the Allies to keep Germany permanently crushed. That is what is felt, and the signs are at present not visible of a disarmament of any nation except Germany. Witness our own war budget or army budget. Under the terror of hunger and the terror of despair you see what is happening. More and more the League of Nations and the Council of Ten and the Council of Four appear to be identified with the council of the victors. Over against that is forming the thing most dangerous, far more dangerous than Germany in its power, the thing most dangerous to the whole of civilization, that is, a revolutionary socialism, driven to despair, spreading from Russia to Hungary, from Hungary to Austria, from Austria it may be to Germany, till you get the League of the Allies confronted with half of Europe in an irredeemable chaos. Who can say that the fault will not be our own? Who can say that we have not been taking the very best steps to secure such an awful result? Meanwhile the League itself is daily causing the distress of all who really care for democracy, showing, as it has, the least possible provision for the real representation of the minds of the nations; substituting for it an autocracy of the ruling Powers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I do not think I can be accused of having exaggerated in any way. Certainly the situation is one in which all who really care for the maintenance of peace, for the principle of unification, must be alert; because, behind Governments, behind our representatives at Paris, there is the mind of nations. The press nowadays is not free. Opinion does not organize itself easily. There is the usual depression and lowering of moral aims which always follows times of war. For the real terror of the time of war is not during the war; then war has certain very ennobling powers. It is after-war periods that are the curse of the world, and it looks as if the same were going to prove true of this war. What we want is an organization of the moral feeling of all mankind, to say that certain things must be and certain things shall not be; that the League of Nations shall not degenerate into a league of the conquerors, to punish and to crush; that Germany must, no doubt, be punished, and will be punished, but in order that it may learn a lesson of reasonableness and of hope, saved and not starved, and feeling that she owes the possibility of her salvation to the change in her own spirit. That is what we want; that is the meaning of the League of Nations: a league of all settled nations which does not give the preponderance to any alliance, but which gives freedom of development to all nations, and is the recognized and frank opponent of militarism and military autocracy in all its forms. That was the meaning of the League of Nations, so it was declared, so all its prophets told us; and what we have got to do is to hold it to its bond.

I own that I never felt anxiety such as I do now. I think the aspect of things has never been so dark as it is at this moment. I think the temper of the nations has become degraded since the declaration of the armistice to a degree that is almost terrifying. Still, we know our grounds of hope, and we must fall back upon them; and first is the determination that our civilization shall not perish. We do not mean that it shall; we do not believe that this is the purpose of God, but we know that there is only one way of escape. We have been told so by all our sanest voices, that the way of escape is the way of suppressing militarism and enthroning right above the insolence, ambitions, the rivalries of particular nations. That is the very meaning of the League of Nations. We know the enemy is no longer the strength of Germany, but rather its weakness, its starvation, and its despair. What we have got to demand of our statesmen is that they shall take a wider and a wiser view than that inspired by the narrowness of revenge and the mere feeling of triumph over an insolent opponent.

Secondly, we put our faith in democracy. It was Erasmus who first said in the sixteenth century that in the long run it was the dynasties who were always in favor of war, and the working people who in the long run were always in favor of peace; and that I believe to be true. But you realize how very far off democracy is in any country from being realized. America, which talked most of democracy, is further off than we are, and we are not very near it. What really rules us? What really speaks in our newspapers? Government of the people, for the people, by the people, is something that is very far off. Yet I believe that the movement of God in history—and there is a purpose of God in history—is toward democracy, and that either through violent rebellion and then reaction—and I hate violent rebellion—or by a progress which can be peaceable because in the last resort the claim of justice is heard, I believe that democracy is the winning cause, and that you cannot fool all the people all the time, as President Lincoln said. They will find out that their interest is not with war but with peace, and not with armaments but with courts of conciliation.

Thirdly, I still put my trust in the arrival of America into the council of Europe, because the traditions of the European nations are so tainted. We do not like to talk about it, but we must talk about it that men may think about it. Think of our traditions in the southeast of Europe, and of the crimes which must be laid to our charge! Think what would have happened if we had not put our money on the wrong horse, and for over half a century maintained and supported Turkey! Think of what would have happened if we had not torn up in the seventies the Treaty of San Stefano, but had allowed things to take their course! The policy was, as Lord Salisbury said, a mistaken policy; he confessed it. The moral results were to saddle us with a responsibility, which we have never half realized, for all the situation which has generated this war in that breeding-plot of wars, the southeast of Europe. No, not because America is better, but because America is free from the complications of Europe, I think we must look with a great hope to the arrival of America into European politics; and we must cling to the belief that America cannot withdraw from the peace any more than she could keep out of the war, and that the arrival of one who is not embarrassed by the complications of old traditions, and can take a free and frank view of the situation, is a great ground of hope.

And, lastly, I should like to be able to appeal to the church. Why have we got away from the ideals of St. Paul? How has it come about that Christianity, of all things in the world, which owed its very beginning to a protest against mere nationalism, should have become so narrow, so restricted, so degraded, as to forget its great voice and to respond so slowly to the appeals? Yet we have responded slowly. Our formal assemblies of the churches have spoken, but it has not become at all a thing which the great mass of Christians are determined to take up. And yet it might have been so. We might have had a league of all churches to behave as one church, to demand the end of militarism and the establishment of that with which indeed the progress and hope of the world can be identified; such a league of all the civilized nations as shall create the supernational authority cognizant of right and justice for all people, and able to enforce itself over any one recalcitrant nation. Meanwhile, the call is indeed the call as of a trumpet to the heart of Christendom. Democracy is so largely preoccupied with its struggles of labor against capital that it forgets, it does not realize, that the far greater enemy is that which is resisting the real establishment of a league of justice among nations. The time is not too late. The fortune of the fray as it is being waged in the council chamber at Paris seems to ebb and flow from day to day, irregularly, and now none can tell the issue. There is actually nothing which ought to be in our prayers, and in every bit of influence which we can use, superior in its claim on us to the claim of that in which I believe the permanence of our civilization is bound up—the establishment of a League of Nations worthy of the name.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

The German Plan for International Labor Regulation

THE semi-official *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* publishes in its issue of February 1 the following draft plan of the German Government for international labor regulation. The paper states that the plan is the result of deliberations by the German Bureau of Labor (Reichsarbeitsamt) in conjunction with employers, trade unions, and well-known social reformers, at the end of 1918. The Government has declared, however, that it will not be bound by the programme unless all other nations accept it, since the provisions of the plan can be carried out only by international agreement.

I.

General Provisions.

1. The treaty of peace terminating the world war also has the task of granting to the workers of all nations a minimum of legal and economic protection. The labor law shall, therefore, as a subject of international regulation, be incorporated in the treaty of peace.

2. Such regulation shall include freedom of migration, right of association, employment bureaus, social insurance, protection of workers, health of workers, government supervision of labor, and international supervision of the execution of the regulations.

The term "worker" shall include every male or female worker or employee of any age or profession. The high contracting states engage to incorporate the following minimum provisions in their legislation and to put them into execution within a period to be fixed for each provision.

II.

Freedom of Migration, Right of Association, Conditions of Labor.

3. Emigration prohibitions and general immigration prohibitions shall be prohibited, provided, however, that this provision shall not affect:

(a) The right of any state to control and to restrict temporarily immigration in order to protect public health;

(b) The right of any state to restrict temporarily the immigration of workers in time of unemployment;

(c) The right of any state to require of the immigrant certain minimum standards of reading and writing for the protection of its culture and for the effective execution of labor protection in industries in which immigrant workers are predominantly employed.

4. The right of association shall be granted to the workers of all states. Laws and regulations precluding certain classes of workers from exercising the right of association and preventing them from representing their economic interests, particularly in the fixing of labor and wage conditions, shall be prohibited, and where such provisions exist, they shall be repealed. Immigrant workers shall enjoy the same rights as the native workers in respect of participation and activity in labor unions, including the right to strike. It shall be punishable to prevent the exercise of the right of association.

5. The alien worker shall be entitled to the wage and labor conditions which have been agreed upon between the labor unions and the employers of his occupation. Where such agreements do not exist, the prevailing wage and labor conditions of his occupation shall be applicable to the alien worker. Agreements with alien workers contrary to the foregoing provision shall be void.

6. No worker may be deported for his activities in labor unions. Appeal to the courts may be had against any order of deportation before its execution.

III.

Employment Bureaus.

7. Recruiting of workers for employment abroad as well as activities of any employment bureau in violation of the provisions of Paragraph 5 shall be prohibited and punishable. Immigration of such workers shall be prohibited and their labor contracts declared void. Shipping companies transporting workers shall be placed under strict control.

8. The high contracting states engage to further the collection of labor statistics on the basis of the publicly organized employment bureaus, and to exchange such statistics frequently through a central international bureau, in order to discourage the workers from travelling to countries where there is little opportunity for employment. Such reports shall be made particularly by the labor unions.

IV.

Social Insurance.

9. The high contracting states shall, in so far as it has not already been done, introduce compulsory insurance of the workers against sickness, accident incident to work, invalidity, old age, and unemployment, and for the deceased's dependents and for motherhood. Such insurance shall be extended to home work [*i. e.*, contract work at home].

10. Alien workers shall, during the period of their employment, be treated as native workers in respect of dues and benefits from social insurance.

11. Workers temporarily employed abroad and workers in the transportation service, employed usually in the territories of several states, shall be insured, as a rule, in accordance with the laws of the state where their employer's principal office is located.

12. Alien workers leaving a country where they have become entitled to insurance benefits shall not lose such benefits if their home state grants similar rights. This, as well as the mode of payment of benefits and the supervision of persons entitled to them, shall be regulated by treaties between the different states.

13. Such treaties shall also determine what sicknesses arising out of employment shall be considered as accidents incident to employment.

14. All documents and certificates as well as any legal proceedings relating to social insurance shall be free of taxes and charges.

V.

Protection of Workers.

15. All states shall develop their legislation relating to general health regulations for employment of all kinds, particularly such as relates to compensation for accidents and sickness.

16. All states shall issue effective regulations regarding the protection of the health of workers, particularly in dangerous employments. Such employments shall include, until further provision is made, mining under ground, steel and iron works, rolling mills, industries in continuous operation or industries using or manufacturing poisons, all tunnel constructions and other employments performed in compressed air below water.

Approved safety appliances for the prevention of accident and sickness arising out of employment shall, by international agreement, be introduced in all states. The list of poisons used in industries compiled by the International Association for the Legal Protection of Workers shall be followed in respect of regulations relating to the health of workers. The use in industries of such poisons for which less dangerous substances can be substituted shall be eliminated.

A special international seamen's law and seamen's protection shall be adopted in coöperation with the organizations of seamen.

17. The working day for all workers in industrial establishments shall not exceed eight hours. Shifts shall be subject to special regulation. Saturday work for female workers shall not exceed four hours. Saturday afternoon shall be free to female workers after twelve o'clock noon. Where in any industry an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exception is unavoidable, female workers shall be granted another free weekday afternoon.

18. The age of children for terminating schooling and for employment for wages in professional, industrial, commercial, or agricultural labor shall be fixed at fourteen. Obligatory, special, or extension school instruction shall be introduced for all juvenile workers between fourteen and eighteen. Juvenile workers shall be given the necessary time free for such instruction.

19. Female workers shall not be employed for a period of ten weeks during childbirth—six weeks at least to be after childbirth. Employers shall be prohibited from giving home work to female workers after working hours.

Female workers shall for the same work receive the same rate of pay as male workers.

20. Night work between 8 p.m. and 6 a.m. shall be prohibited by law except where, for technical reasons, particular industries require such night work.

21. All workers shall by law be granted a weekly rest period of thirty-two hours between Saturday and Monday. Exceptions may be made of any labor essential to insure the resumption of work on Monday, as well as of work which, for technical reasons, cannot be interrupted, or of trades necessary for the recreation and education of the public on Sundays. In all these cases the thirty-two hours' uninterrupted rest period must be granted on weekdays. The exceptions shall be fixed specifically by law. In industries in continuous operation reserve shifts shall be provided to insure the weekly uninterrupted rest period of thirty-two hours. The shifts shall be so regulated that the workers have a free Sunday at least every third week.

22. All laws and regulations relating to the protection of workers shall be applied *mutatis mutandis* to home industry.

Home work shall be prohibited:

(a) In employments particularly hazardous on account of danger to health or danger of poisoning;

(b) In employments connected with the manufacture or packing of food stuffs—necessaries or luxuries.

Infectious diseases, to be specially designated, in dwellings where home work is done must be reported. If such action results in the prohibition of home work in these dwellings, the persons affected by this prohibition shall be compensated.

The health of minors employed in home work shall receive medical supervision.

Employers of home workers shall be required by law to keep open lists of their workers and their wages. Minimum wages of home workers shall be fixed by wage-equalization bureaus and shall be legally binding.

VI.

Supervision of Labor.

23. Employers of at least five workers speaking a foreign language shall be required by law:

(a) To post regulations concerning labor and all other prescribed announcements in the language of such workers;

(b) To provide at their own expense for the instruction of such workers in the language of the country in order to enable them to understand the terms used in the employment.

24. The execution of the provisions for labor protection (Article V) shall in all states be supervised by a labor supervisory board. The officials appointed shall be experts, particularly male and female workers; they shall be independent and be given full powers for effective control of all employments. Such supervising officials shall prepare annual reports concerning their activities and observations. These reports shall be compiled and published. Uniform international norms shall be adopted as standards to which these reports shall conform. The state authorities shall assist the consular representatives of the home country in protecting alien workers.

25. For the effective supervision of labor protection the committees, control bureaus, and secretariats of professional organizations shall be consulted.

VII.

International Bureaus.

26. In order to coördinate the legislation of the different countries relating to protection of labor, taking into account the respective differences, and to assure the workers in all countries affected that consideration in matters of social insurance would offer equal advantage, the high contracting Powers shall convoke conferences. These conferences shall meet whenever necessary, or at least once every five years.

Each Power shall have one vote at such conferences. Binding resolutions may be passed only by a four-fifths majority of the Powers voting.

A permanent commission shall be established at Berne to prepare the work of the conferences, to supervise effective execution of the decisions of the conferences, and to furnish information pertaining to social-political questions. Each of the high contracting Powers and the International Labor Union and the International Labor Office at Basel may send one delegate to this commission. Admission of delegates from other organizations shall be reserved. The commission shall meet within six months at least after the ratification of this treaty.

27. The commission shall in its activities coöperate with the International Labor Office and use the facilities of the latter as far as possible; provided, however, that the International Labor Office shall continue its functions along the present lines and extend them to social insurance. The contracting powers shall as far as possible further the activities of the International Labor Office, and, if necessary, make money contributions.

The South African Nationalists

THE five documents which follow state the claims of the National party in South Africa to independence. The delegates appointed by the Joint Conference were prevented by a threatened strike of seamen from proceeding directly to England, and in consequence journeyed *via* New York. They sailed from New York for Havre on April 9.

Resolution of the Congress of the National Party of Transvaal

Bloemfontein, January 16, 1919

By virtue of the now generally recognized principles with regard to the restoration of violated rights and liberties of small nations, this Congress of the National party of the Transvaal claims complete restoration of all violated rights and liberties of the former South African Republic;

And therefore this Congress resolves to appoint and send delegates to Europe with the object of carrying out the above resolution, and further to endeavor to secure the complete independence of the whole Union of South Africa.

Resolution of the Congress of the National Party of the Orange Free State

Bloemfontein, January 16, 1919

This Congress of the National party of the Orange Free State, held at Bloemfontein on the 16th day of January, 1919, representing the overwhelming majority of registered voters, aware of the strong feeling and desire on the part of the people of the Orange Free State in favor of the restoration of their former status of freedom and independence, and having taken cognizance of the war-aims as enunciated by the leading Allied statesmen and of the declarations made, in harmony with the eternal principles of right and justice, by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, by Dr. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, and by other leading statesmen of civilized nations, to wit, that every nation has an inalienable right to freedom, and that no nation has the right to deprive another nation, however small or weak, of its liberty; and that when it affects the liberty of nations violated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights shall be restored; desires to express its full agreement therewith;

And taking further into consideration the act of violence by which the late Republic of the Orange Free State was deprived of its liberty and independence, and the honorable history of that Republic during the entire period of its existence;

Declares the destruction of its free and independent existence an act of wrong and injustice, and in violation of the recognized principles above mentioned;

Expresses the conviction that complete independence, and that alone, will be able to establish and to confirm those friendly relations between the different sections of the people, and between South Africa and the United Kingdom, upon which the peace and quiet in South Africa so largely depend, and for the attainment of which this Congress longs and seeks.

Wherefore this Congress resolves that the time has arrived for the people of the Orange Free State, whose liberty has been violated, to claim that restitution be made to it of the freedom and independence of which it has been deprived; and

It is accordingly by this Congress decided that two persons, to be nominated by it, be delegated to Europe in order to urge with all due earnestness upon his Majesty, that such a restoration of liberty and independence be made to the Orange Free State, and to take all such further steps, with a view to securing such restoration, as they may deem fit.

Resolution of the Congress of the National Party of the Cape

Bloemfontein, January 17, 1919

This Congress of the National party of the Cape, held at Bloemfontein on the 17th day of January, 1919, expresses its firm conviction that the overwhelming majority of the Dutch-speaking population of South Africa will not be satisfied and will not rest until South Africa is completely independent and separated from the British Empire.

This Congress has taken note of the resolutions adopted yesterday by the Congresses of the National parties of the Orange Free State and Transvaal, and is of opinion that the existing Union may not and should not be an obstacle to the restoration of the violated rights of the old Republics.

This Congress is further convinced that only such independence and separation will remove the injured feelings and the bitter recollections caused by the injustice of the original annexation of the Cape and the wrongs following thereon, bring about a better understanding and a real and lasting peace between the different sections of the population of South Africa, and establish and promote healthy and friendly relations between South Africa and the United Kingdom.

Resolution of the Congress of the National Party of Natal

Bloemfontein, January 17, 1919

This Congress of the National party of Natal, assembled at Bloemfontein on the 17th day of January, 1919, herewith expresses its firm conviction that the great majority of the Dutch-speaking population of South Africa will not be satisfied and will not rest until South Africa is completely independent of and completely separated from the British Empire.

The Congress has taken note of the resolutions adopted by the Congresses of the National parties of the Orange Free State and Transvaal on January 16th, 1919, and is of opinion that the existing Union may not and should not be an obstacle to the restoration of violated rights.

The Congress further resolves that the National party of Natal will always strive with determination and courage for the independence of the whole of South Africa. Only by means of such independence and separation will the injured feelings and the bitter recollections in South Africa, caused by the injustice of the original annexation of Natal and the wrongs following thereon, be eliminated, and can a better understanding and a real and lasting peace be arrived at between the different sections of the population of South Africa, and healthy and friendly relations be created and promoted between South Africa and the United Kingdom.

Resolution of the Joint Congress of the National Parties in South Africa

Bloemfontein, January 17, 1919

This Joint Congress of the National party of the Cape, the Orange Free State, the Transvaal, and Natal, held at Bloemfontein on the 17th day of January, 1919, joins in all humility in the expression of thanks to Almighty God for the termination of the terrible bloodshed of the past four years with its accompanying horrors, and for the hope of a just and lasting peace, giving rise to a new world order.

This Congress has with joy taken note of the declaration of Mr. Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England, that "no peace is possible until reparation has been made for violated rights and liberties, and until the principle of nationalities and the independent existence of small states is recognized"; and of President Wilson, in the name of the United States of America, that "clearly defined national aspirations must be satisfied."

This Congress therefore rejoices that the right of every civilized people to liberty and the restoration of violated rights and liberties are recognized and accepted as cardinal principles of the new world order.

This Congress wishes further to emphasize the following points:

1. The wounds of 1899-1902, when the independence of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State was forcibly and, in the opinion of the Africanders and almost the whole world outside the British Empire, unjustly destroyed, have never healed.

2. The Union of 1910 has in no way extended the liberty of South Africa, and the submission to it must be looked upon not as an act of acquiescence in the destruction of the Republics, but as an act of agreement with a measure taken under the circumstances arising out of the peace treaty of 1902, which was forcibly imposed upon the Boers.

3. Experience, and especially that of the last years, has aroused the conviction in the heart of the Africander that the objections to the present form of government in South Africa are of a more practical nature and more calculated to disturb the peace and happiness of South Africa than was previously believed.

4. The objections to the various ways in which the United Kingdom still exercises authority over South Africa are implanted not only in the authority itself or the use thereof, but much more in the feeling thereby engendered in the English and Dutch sections of our population that the English section is in the position of a privileged class, a thing which creates and intensifies intolerance on one side and bitterness on the other.

5. The movement for the closer union of the British Empire makes these conditions worse, and will continue to do so more and more.

6. No true and lasting peace and contentment is possible not only until violated rights are restored, but until the whole Union is entirely independent and parted from the British Empire, by which step alone complete equality between the English and Dutch sections of the population and healthy and friendly relations between South Africa and the United Kingdom can be established and furthered.

7. The Dutch population will always resolutely strive for and employ all constitutional means to obtain such complete independence.

On these grounds this Joint Congress fully agrees with the resolutions taken yesterday and today at Bloemfontein by the Congresses of the Cape, the Orange Free State, the Transvaal, and Natal, in the full expectation and belief that justice will be done.

The great majority of the Dutch population of South Africa are convinced that their feelings and desires and the true state of affairs in South Africa can and should only be brought to

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the notice of the British Government by means of their own deputations, and that this will not be done by the Government of the Union of South Africa. After the statements made by General Botha and his Ministers in connection with it, they have no hope that the Government of the Union will further any attempt to obtain independence.

This Joint Congress further resolves to nominate General C. R. de Wet, General J. B. M. Hertzog, M.L.A., Dr. D. F. Malan, M.L.A., Advocate F. W. Beyers, K.C., M.L.A., Senator A. D. W. Wolmarans, P. G. W. Grobler, Esq., A. T. Spies, Esq., Advocate E. G. Jansen, as delegates to the British Government and the Peace Conference, to act as far as necessary as a joint deputation in the interests of the future of South Africa.

"A Dissection of Dora"

UNDER the above title the National Council for Civil Liberties, London, issues the following analysis of what may or may not now be done under the British Defence of the Realm Act, familiarly known as "D. O. R. A."

Occupation and Control of Land, Buildings, etc.

The Government can still take land or buildings wherever and whenever it thinks fit. Since the armistice, the regulations have extended its powers in this respect for purposes connected with pensions and demobilization. It can also take such things as trees, coal, and food, and can control the actions of retailers, factory proprietors, agriculturalists, inventors, etc.

You may now, however, build without a license. You may also, if you own or occupy an engineering factory, try to get workmen from other factories. You may also sell your horses and you may keep a stray dog if you find one.

Control of Meetings.

The Government can still prohibit the holding of any meeting or procession, if it thinks that disorder or disaffection will be caused. Any group of opponents may still, therefore, prevent the holding of a meeting by informing the authorities that they intend to break it up. It is still an offence in areas where martial law is declared to take part in meetings, wear any uniform whatsoever, carry anything capable of being used as a weapon of offence, or possess or use a motor-cycle without a military permit, and the military or police can go anywhere, stop and search anyone, and seize any of the prohibited articles.

You may now, however, hold a race or coursing meeting; you cannot have your bank or other holidays prohibited; you may run a dog show, or you may organize a village fair.

Powers of Search, Interrogation, and Arrest.

The authorities can still enter your house by force at any time of the day or night, search it, seize any printing apparatus you may have, destroy it or anything else they think prejudicial to the public safety, including any MSS. contravening certain of the above regulations. They can also send constables to attend any meeting or gathering in your house, or turn you out and shut it up, if they think your use of it calculated to cause disaffection among the civil population. If you are driving along the road, any soldier may stop you and, if he is suspicious of you, seize your vehicle.

You need not now, however, always answer any question addressed to you by a military man or a police constable, though, if his chief authorizes him, he can make you do so. . . .

Movements of the Civil Population.

The Government can still, through its military representatives, remove or keep away from any locality any person it suspects and order him or her to keep the police or the military informed of his or her whereabouts. It can also put restrictions on or intern anyone whose ancestors came from the enemy countries, or who associates with any enemy aliens, and, indeed, where martial law has been proclaimed, it can do these things to any one at all whom it suspects of being about to do something it considers prejudicial to the public safety.

You may now, however, leave the kingdom as a member of the crew of a neutral ship, and you are free from two things: being cleared with all your neighbors out of a particular place, and being forbidden to go out of doors after a certain hour in the evening.

Collection and Communication of Information.

The Government can still punish you for collecting, or even trying to find out, anything about the fleet, or the army, or the air force, for possessing a carrier pigeon, or setting up a wireless apparatus, for taking in letters for people without being registered, for sending a code letter out of the country, for importing a newspaper of which the authorities disapprove, or for publishing or even giving away a leaflet bearing on the war or on the settlement without sending it three days before to the Censor.

You may now, however, set up signalling apparatus, you may take photographs, you may let off fireworks, and you may report the proceedings of last year's Irish Convention.

Munitions of War.

The Government can still prevent you from selling to aliens any interests in oilfields, copper mines, or factories in a number of neutral countries; it can punish you for possessing firearms or explosives in many parts of the country without special permission from the military, and it can search your premises and punish you if you have more than a certain quantity of films for the cinema.

You may now, however, commit acts calculated to increase the cost of war materials and, if you are fortunate enough, you can deal in them. . . .

Moral or General Behavior.

The Government can still punish men or women whose behavior it thinks likely to be bad for the efficiency of soldiers, sailors, or people concerned with munitions, or can deport them from any place where soldiers, sailors, etc., are stationed. Indignant public protest has, however, procured the withdrawal of the regulation which put upon any woman arrested by the police on the ground of soliciting a member of the forces the choice between being punished or submitting to a degrading medical examination to prove that she was not diseased. . . .

Freedom of Speech.

The Government can still punish you if you say anything likely to prejudice the recruiting of soldiers, sailors, munition workers, policemen, or firemen, or, indeed, anything likely to prejudice their discipline or to disturb their equanimity in any way. Moreover, if you have in your possession or under your control any document containing anything which might do any of these things, it is just as bad. Nor may you say anything likely to cause disaffection among the civil population or to impede the production of war material.

You may now, however, communicate with a soldier or sailor with a view to his transfer or release—an action previously punishable even though the retention of the man was illegal.

Certificates of Exemption from Military Service.

The Government can still punish you for having in your possession any sort of form or certificate of exemption made out for anyone but yourself, or for destroying, losing, or keeping one which you are supposed to keep or return to the authorities.

You may now, however, tamper with or refuse to produce certificates of exemption granted otherwise than under the Military Service acts. You may also refuse, if you have or have had such a certificate, to be medically examined, and you are not punished under this Act, at any rate, if you make false statements to prevent yourself or anyone else being called up. These concessions may have been made because there are now no such certificates, medical examinations, or callings up.

Obligation to Assist the Authorities.

The Government can still punish you if you disobey orders

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given in accordance with any regulation by any military or other authority; or if you assist or harbor anyone who is disobeying them, as, for example, if you let lodgings to a man who has neglected to inform the military or the police that he has heard of a carrier pigeon which has a broken wing; or if you know of anyone who is committing any offence under the Act, *e.g.*, letting lodgings to a man who, etc., and fail to tell the naval or military authority about it. And, finally, if you do anything at all, whether mentioned in the 100 pages or so of regulations or not, which in the opinion of the authorities is intended to assist Germany, Austria, Turkey, Bulgaria, or any other enemy country to do anything, you are at once deemed to be guilty of an offence against the regulations and will be punished, unless, presumably, you can show precisely where in the regulations the act of which you are guilty does not come.

Justice Under the Act.

In most cases the court which tries offenders under this Act is dependent for its information as to whether the public safety has been endangered, recruiting impeded, the enemy assisted, or whatever it may be, on the assertion of the competent naval or military authority. In order to simplify procedure it is in general provided that this same authority should be the prosecutor. He thus decides both whether the prosecution shall be brought and whether the act is an offence. The judge or magistrate is privileged to determine whether the accused performed the act or not, and for evidence he must usually go to the competent naval or military authority. It does not, therefore, make very much difference whether the court is civil or military. The two or three pages of regulations as to which it has to be in particular cases are still in force, but are not likely to be of much assistance in establishing the innocence of any accused person.

The regulation that officers or other persons authorized by the Director-General of National Service may be prosecutors has recently been withdrawn. This concession is due to the abolition of the office of Director-General of National Service.

Defence of the Realm from Strikes.

That the Act is not to be used for the defence of the realm from foreign enemies alone has been shown by the recently promulgated regulation which put electricity on the same footing as gas and water, and thus made it an offence by breaking a contract to cut off the supply of electricity. This was used to defeat a threatened strike of the Electrical Trades Union. No doubt further extensions of this principle are feasible.

The Mid-European Union and the Ukraine

THE following open letter, dated April 1, has been addressed to Mr. Herbert Adolphus Miller, secretary of the Mid-European Union, Washington, by the Ukrainian Federation of the United States.

From the telegram sent from Washington and printed in New York newspapers on March 28 we learned of a peculiar appeal which, under your signature and the signature of Mr. Orlando Ducker, was sent to President Wilson, to Secretaries Baker and Daniels, and to the American peace delegates. In this appeal you are prevailing upon and appealing to the United States Government and the Allied nations to assure an immediate supply to the present Governments of Esthonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugoslavia, and Rumania of arms, ammunition, and other war materials necessary in their struggle against the red armies of Russia and Hungary. Referring to your close connection with the representatives of these countries, you express your confidence that, with the moral and material support of the United States and other Allies, the countries mentioned will succeed in overpowering Bolshevism.

This is the purport of your appeal as given by the New York press. As it represents an unexpected turn in the tendencies of the Mid-European Union, we ask leave to consider it for a moment before we follow, or refuse to follow, you.

Our attitude towards so-called Bolshevism generally, and towards the present Russian Government in particular, seems to be known to you. It is also known to you that the Ukraine put up a stubborn fight against Bolshevist invasion, and that she was annexed by the Muscovite Commissaries long before the so-called Bolshevist danger threatened the frontiers of Poland and Rumania.

During the struggle of our people, we, the Ukrainian immigrants, did not seek either military or moral support from the Allied nations. We did not seek it for the reason that the present policies of the Allies, we regret to say, give no guarantee that their intervention would aid the free self-determination of the Ukrainian people against the Russian armies and the violence of the Russian Government. On the contrary, the policy of the Allied Governments, up to this time, can only justify the suspicion that their intervention would restrict the free will of the Ukrainian people and popular rule in the Ukraine in favor of the old Russian order and the imperialistic interests of Poland.

And, not having sought Allied support for the Ukrainian people, we must protest against sending aid against them.

We are convinced that you care for nothing else than to secure the peoples of Esthonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Rumania against Bolshevist invasion. But, up to this time, has any guarantee been given by the above-mentioned Governments that they want this and no more? What kind of guarantees can you give in their name to the Government and the people of the United States?

In particular how can you guarantee to us that the Government of Messrs. Dmowski, Paderewski, and Pilsudski will use your arms, ammunition, and war materials only to defend their nation against the Russian Bolshevists, and not for the purpose of strengthening their imperialistic and reactionary designs, for the purpose of the occupation of the Ukraine and Lithuania, for the national enslavement of the Ukrainian people, and the economic exploitation of the Ukrainian peasantry?

Has not your close connection with representatives of the oppressed people taught you what is behind the present fighting in middle Europe? Have not these very representatives of the present Polish Government, Messrs. Paderewski and Dmowski, left the Mid-European Union simply because they refuse to recognize the principle of self-determination as applied to the Ukrainian people, even here refused to agree that the questions in dispute between the Poles and the Ukrainians should be decided by the popular will through a plébiscite? Didn't these very newspapers which published your appeal publish also the appeal of Pilsudski? And didn't the Polish general ask for arms, ammunition, and materials to fight on four fronts, among others, against the Ukrainians?

Can't you guess on what front the American ammunition will be used if it is sent to the Polish generals? And does it behoove you to advise the American Government to give moral and material support in eastern Europe to men of this sort—men whose aims are hardly distinguishable from the aims of those against whom the sons of America were fighting with huge sacrifices in the West?

And surely, whatever may be the danger of destruction by Bolshevism, only the freedom and prosperity of a people can withstand it, certainly not the arms and ammunition of the forces of oppression and reaction.

We do not believe that the American Government will follow your advice and force the Ukrainian masses to choose between Trotzky and Paderewski. It would be better for the whole world if they should choose the third road—towards possession of the land and freedom.

And though your appeal will have hardly any effect, still we wish that it had never been made, and that the Mid-European Union would turn from recommending the supply of arms and ammunition to the bloody battlefields of Europe to its previous activities, which are, to furnish America with reliable information about this struggle, its crimes and wrongs, its aims and hopes.

LIBRARY
WALDEN-WALLACE COLLEGE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Press

Germany and the Peace Terms

THE attitude which Germany should take toward the peace terms formulated by the Paris Conference is discussed at length by Otto Hoetzsch in the Berlin *Kreuzzeitung* of March 19.

Whether a programme is possible also depends on the procedure, whether lengthy negotiations, the scope of which must be within the fourteen points, are instituted. But at the present time it is necessary to define the general attitude of our representatives at Paris, of Parliament, of public opinion, in regard to what may happen. First come questions of the past, questions concerning the responsibility for the war. The most sensible thing would be if all parties—and this refers also to internal disputes—were to accept the point of view of the English Socialist, Thomas, who declared at the Berne Conference: "We will leave the question of responsibility to historians." But our opponents wish it otherwise, and we cannot avoid this discussion. But our Government and our representatives are not sufficiently equipped for it. It can be seen by the manner in which the matter is treated by the Entente that it is not quite simple to solve this question of the responsibility for the war, which was originally placed with so much *éclat* in the foreground. It is now reported that a memorandum of Lansing proving Germany's guilt is to be incorporated in the peace treaty, by which means the Entente would avoid all further discussion. Germany would then, in accepting the treaty, have signed her own confession of guilt, and the Entente would reap the benefit of having influenced the opinion of the world against Germany for years to come. But this must not be done. Why is the publication of the complete material at the disposal of our Government not forthcoming? It has been repeatedly promised, but has never appeared. We have no reason to fear it. It can and will supply Germany with many grounds for criticizing the conduct of her foreign policy, but of this we alone, and not the Entente, are judges. On the other hand, it will give them no occasion for moral preaching, but will only prove that no one in Germany desired war; and that is the main issue. Besides, the German proposal of an international court of law, to be entrusted with all the material, still holds good, provided our opponents place this material completely at its disposal. In the *Kreuzzeitung* of March 13, it was proved that if proceedings are instituted against individuals, they can only be instituted against such as are constitutionally responsible, that is to say, von Bethmann-Hollweg, von Jagow, and the Minister of War, Falkenhayn. These men would doubtless protect the person of the monarch. This method of procedure would protect Emperor William II against the purpose, still existing in the Entente, especially in England, of holding him responsible.

The Entente connects the question of responsibility with that of indemnity. Churchill has again raised this question; from France exaggerated demands are constantly being heard. Germany is prepared to give indemnity for injury done, but the Entente would do well to consider what is put forward in a recently published book by Steinmann Bucher, "The Peace of Nations," that Germany at present is not in a position to pay immense indemnities. The intention to enforce these indemnities by German slave labor in the reconstruction of northern France is impossible. But Germany will and can assist in this reconstruction with technical and other labor which will reveal most distinctly the community of German and French economic interests; but she must be granted the economic and political possibilities.

France is at present incapable of seeing this community of interests; the idea of a policy of military security reigns supreme, a security against pretended future German attacks, which must be guaranteed to the utmost extent by territorial and military means. Nothing further need be said in regard to Alsace-Lorraine; in this respect the representatives must adhere strictly to the demand that only a free plébiscite can determine the future fate of these countries. But the Saar territory, to which France has raised claims, is historically and nationally pure German territory. To steal it—the desire to do so is prompted purely by the coal fields—would be the worst violation of Wilson's points that could be imagined. But France goes even further with her desire for the left bank of the Rhine, for a Rhine frontier. This demand we naturally cannot discuss, not even in the form that we should not be allowed to maintain a garrison on the left bank of the Rhine. In the same manner we must refuse the Belgian claims in the Rhineland, as well as the idea of internationalizing the Rhine, which the Commission intends to bring forward at the Peace Conference. Is it not absolutely self-destructive in the face of such claims to agitate for the foundation of a Rhenish-Westphalian Republic with a corridor to the North Sea and in conjunction with Rhenish Hesse and the Rhenish Palatinate? This agitation, which has already gone much further in its intentions and successful accomplishment than is generally acknowledged, is playing directly into the hands of the Entente, if it is not working in conjunction with them. It intends to operate within the framework of the German Empire, but, in fact, it supports the French plans of a confederation of the Rhine, and would create a helpless buffer state for which there is as little justification as for the projected buffer states of Belgium and Poland, which did so much harm during the war. The men behind this plan at Cologne ought to see what harm they are doing to Germany; that by destroying the unity of Prussia they are destroying the unity of the Empire; that they are directly fostering a policy of boundary states in the west and the east, for which France is endeavoring to obtain sanction from her Allies.

For security it is also considered necessary that Germany should be disarmed and made defenceless. To what extent this is to be carried out is not yet known. But we know that France has no intention of disarming, that England will retain a standing army, that America under no conditions will reduce her army to less than 510,000 men. But we are to have only a police militia, to surrender our navy, to raze the fortifications of Heligoland and the Kiel Canal, to stand defenceless against France by land and against England by sea; not to omit that we are to be deprived by international law of the use of the submarine, and that we are to lose our fleet, while the Russian fleet is to be maintained. That is not disarmament for the prevention of future wars. If the negotiations at Paris are carried out in this sense, then the problem of disarmament with which Wilson has taken so much trouble will not be advanced a single step. And the same refers to the League of Nations. If instead of a real new system of states with equal rights, which are drawn more closely to one another by their mutual relations and are ready to submit to an increasingly international agreement, it becomes only a limited company of the victors, especially of the Anglo-Saxons, then it will not produce a durable peace, but only an interval between two universal wars.

In regard to all these claims of military, territorial, and so-called international right, the basis for our representatives lies in the fourteen points, with the two restrictions in regard to the restoration of occupied territories and the freedom of the seas which we accepted in accordance with the note of the President on November 5. That we should not go beyond this has just been restated emphatically by Count Bernstorff. If our opponents adhere to this basis lengthy negotiations will naturally ensue. For these points, by their elasticity and vagueness, invite discussion, that is to say, the desire to arrive at an understanding. But should prolonged negotiations at Paris be possible, then the programme for our representatives springs naturally out of the fourteen points and goes on to the union of German-Austria, to an understanding with the Czechs, and to the problems of the East, particularly to the Russian problem, which in the prolonged course of these negotiations leading up to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace assumes, in all respects, a different aspect from that which it bears at present. If the definitive draft of the preliminary peace goes beyond these points, then Germany must refuse it, and will do so. In England this possibility is being taken into consideration. Churchill stated that in that case powerful armies would advance into Germany. For what purpose and with what aim are these powerful armies to advance? Are they to march into German Bolshevism, which will then become victorious, when the endeavors for peace of our present Government have been wrecked by our enemies? The National Assembly must refuse a dictated peace, for they were elected, as far as foreign politics are concerned, on the basis of Wilson's points. They are not empowered to accept any other peace; they must refuse it or refer it to a plébiscite.

Germany has been beaten; as in 1807 the will of a revengeful enemy was imposed on Prussia, so it can now be imposed on her. But permanent foundations for a world peace which Wilson's speech of 1917 demanded will not be thus created. If our enemies force us to refuse the peace, then Germany will sink into even worse calamity than at present; but this result will certainly not be productive of happiness to our opponents, for they require a well-ordered German state and a quiet, active German people as much as Germany does. At present Wilson can use but relatively small pressure for the attainment of his ideals. We naturally hope that he will prevail, but we must be armed and prepared for the possibility of the contrary.

The Socialist Strength in Finland

THE following estimate of the Socialist strength in Finland at the time of the elections to the Finnish Diet appeared in the *Social-Demokraten* (Christiania) of March 12.

The results of the elections for the Diet in Finland are beyond expectation and well worth noting. They show that, in spite of the numerical loss, our party has come out of the struggle stronger than before.

In the elections of 1916 which gave the Social Democrats an absolute plurality in the Diet and led to the formation of the Oscar Tokoi Ministry—that which was turned out by the bourgeoisie with the aid of Kerensky's Cossacks—the Social Democrats had 375,306 votes and all the bourgeois parties together 419,470. This year the Social Democrats have 48 per cent. of the votes then received, or 179,863 votes. But the bourgeois parties have only 67.4 per cent. of the votes of 1916, or about 274,000 votes.

It would seem, at first glance, that the Social Democrats have lost more than the others, but it must be remembered that more than 100,000 Social Democrats have been disfranchised because of their part in the civil war, and thousands of others are in exile, among them 10,000 in Russia alone. The Social Democrats are therefore even now actually the largest party in the country, and have gained more in the elections than have the bourgeois parties.

To this must be added several other factors of the greatest significance. The Social-Democratic press has been wiped out. During the elections the party had only one newly-started paper in Helsingfors and a few smaller sheets, while the bourgeois parties had their powerful press all over the country, which carried on the most terrible vilification of the Social Democrats. Moreover, the party had been deprived of all its meeting-places. Although the labor movement had been promised the return of its People's Houses, that resolution was "sabotaged" by the communal authorities, so that only a few had been returned before the elections.

From this it will be seen what a disadvantage the party labored under during the elections, but it also shows plainly how strong socialism has grown in the hearts and minds of the Finnish people as a consequence of the bloody civil war and the ensuing white terror with its cruelties.

The disposition of parties in the Diet will now be such that the Social Democrats will have eighty-one representatives, and the Agrarians, who in various matters of principle as well as in practical measures stand with the Social Democrats, will have thirty-five. The two together, then, will have 116 out of a total of 200.

Allied Intrigue in Russia

IN an article in a recent issue of the *Narodnaya Gazeta* (New York), a Russian weekly newspaper which represents the anti-Bolshevist propaganda in this country, Mr. Andrew Argoonov, a member of the Omsk Directorate who, with two other members, was ousted from office by Admiral Kolchak, throws some interesting light on the course of the Allies in Russia. After describing the organization of the "Union for the Regeneration of Russia," which was instrumental in the formation of the Ufa and Omsk "All-Russian" Governments, Mr. Argoonov continues:

From the very beginning of its activity the Union entered into regular and frequent communication with the representatives of the Allied missions stationed at Moscow, Petrograd, and Vologda, chiefly through the French Ambassador, M. Noulens. The representatives of the Allies were thoroughly familiarized with the objects of the Union and its personnel, and repeatedly expressed their readiness to assist it in every way, fully sharing the views of the Union upon the problems of home and foreign politics. These declarations concerning assistance bore an official, not a private, character, being usually attended by references to the fact that the action of these representatives met with the approval of their respective home Governments. Among other things the Union submitted for the consideration of the representatives of the Allied missions a detailed plan of a military campaign on Russian territory with the coöperation of Allied armies, which plan was transmitted abroad. . . .

In June, 1918, M. Noulens in a semi-official way made known to certain political organizations in Moscow, including the Union for the Regeneration of Russia, a note wherein were stated the views of the Allies concerning their objects in relation to Russia. In that note were repeated almost in full the principles of the political platform of the Union. First of all, the decision of the Allied Governments to furnish armed forces for the common fight against the German-Bolshevist army was categorically confirmed, these forces to be numerous enough to bear the brunt in the beginning and thereby to enable the small Russian anti-Bolshevist detachments to develop into a considerable regular army. As an expression of private opinion and advice, the note recommended a series of measures for the internal reconstruction of Russia. Denying the possibility of any understanding with the Bolsheviki, the Allies advanced first of all the plan of creating one all-Russian coalition power, in the shape of a directorate of three men responsible to no one until the time of the meeting of the existing Constitutional Convention. However, in relation to the latter a substantial qualification was made in the note. Pointing out the imperfections of the existing Constitutional Convention, the Allies denied its right to act as a permanent legislative and supervisory body, conceding only the opening of its deliberations for the briefest period (of two or three meetings), in order that the Constitutional Convention should sanction by its authority the Government previously created and the governmental apparatus organized by it, should work out a law for the elections to a new Constitutional Convention, and should thereby end its existence.

In reference to the foregoing statement, it should be observed that the election law under which the first Constitutional Convention was elected had been drafted by a commission appointed by the Kerensky Government, and that the deliberations of the commission extended over several

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months. According to Mr. Argoonov's account, a new election law was to be drafted at two or three sittings, the Bolsheviki and their associates, in the meantime, being excluded from the session of the convention at which the amended law was to be framed.

Georg Brandes on the Peace Settlement

THE following interview with Georg Brandes, recently given to an American correspondent in Sweden, was intended for a New York newspaper, but appears never to have been published. The sections in italics were inserted by M. Brandes as additions to the remainder of the interview.

Georg Brandes takes an extremely pessimistic view of the work of the Peace Congress and the prospects for the world's peace. He said today in an interview:

"The Allies are drunk with victory, and are too bent upon inflicting punishments to make a just and durable peace. I am an old man and can well remember that when Paris surrendered, trainloads of provisions were in movement from England within twenty-four hours to feed the hungry. But what do we see now? Germany surrendered more than three months ago, but the Allies still prevent the provisioning of Germany. Surely no peace made in that spirit can be followed by those feelings of political contentment upon which any peace must finally rest."

Asked what he thought of Wilson's peace programme and its chances of success, Brandes replied: *"I admire and appreciate the principles of President Wilson, but I cannot understand how anyone who has his eyes open can for a moment believe in their realization.* Wilson was received in the Allied countries like a king, and many beautiful speeches were made to him; but we now see that those speeches were only phrases, mere camouflage for peace terms contradictory to Wilson's principles."

Here Brandes asked the correspondent whether Wilson had the united support of the American people for his policy of moderation; to which the correspondent was compelled to admit some doubt in view of recent political events and discussions in Congress and the press. Brandes continued: "Wilson's policy of moderation is the only right one, especially his demand for self-determination of peoples; but has he the strength of will to carry it through? Already a breach has apparently been made in it in the case of Alsace-Lorraine, with Wilson permitting it to be assigned to France as a prize of war. But such a settlement does not satisfy the people concerned. It was the American troops that gave the final decision in the war, and therefore Wilson saved the Allies; for they clearly could not have won without American help. But England and France do not admit that; they claim that they won the war, and that they are therefore entitled to the controlling voice in shaping the terms of peace. Wilson will now go to Washington, but when he returns to Paris he will find everything arranged among the Allies during his absence. After having won the war the Allies will say to him: 'The Moor has done his duty; the Moor can go.'"

"And the prospects for a lasting peace?" the correspondent ventured to interpose. Here the professor thrust his body forward over his desk, raised his hands, and exclaimed in despairing tones: "Horrible, horrible! I fear we shall have more wars than ever. *War cannot bring peace. Only love and mercy bring peace, and where are love and mercy? I see only the terrible weapons of blockade and civil wars in more than one country. A peace between thirst for revenge on the one side, exhaustion and prostration on the other side, will now be dry-nursed under famine and shouts of triumph. This newborn peace is not ruddy-cheeked.*

"Peace can only rest upon good-will on all sides; but the Allies are not even trying to create good-will on the opposing side. Statesmen acting in that spirit may have the satisfaction of glutting their own revenge; but what of the world's future? what of humanity?

"The Allies are shocked by the horrible disorders in Russia, but they have coöperated with the Czecho-Slovaks, who have blocked the access of food supplies from Siberia to Russia. They are consequently partly responsible for the disorder there. The serious food shortage in Russia is aggravating the disorganization. The Russian people want peace.

"The League of Nations is nothing but the Holy Alliance of 1815 once more. The effective control of affairs will be in the hands of Britain, France, Italy, and America; and America will be eliminated. The decisions will be taken at the preliminary meetings, and the other nations will be invited formally to ratify the decisions. The war for small nations is to end in a peace of Great Powers. The war against pretended world domination by the Central Powers is to end in the real domination of their victors. I have before me the telegrams of Tunis and Algiers to Wilson; who can believe that they will be discussed?

"The League of Nations may disestablish war in the old formal sense of the word; but it will sanctify power in a new and sinister sense. The new concert will use force all the world over—to intervene in Russia, to [effect] *the partition of Turkey, etc. The French Government has already arranged the administration of Galilee.*

"The whole of the Germanic and Slavic races will, I fear, be reduced to a position of vassalage. This is natural as an outcome of revenge, but has nothing to do with the dawn of a new age."

"Cant About Ireland"

ASSERTING that no Secretary of State for Ireland "ever cut a sorrier figure than Mr. Macpherson last week in the Irish debate," the London *Nation*, in an editorial entitled "Cant About Ireland," in its issue of April 12, intimates that "the prophets are already looking out for another Chief Secretary," and continues:

We are occupying Rhineland as a conquered country with some tens of thousands of conscript soldiers. We are occupying Ireland as a conquered country with some tens of thousands of conscript soldiers. The only difference appears to be that in the former case our occupation is, on the whole, accepted by the people as a temporary evil. In the latter, it is fiercely resented as a permanent wrong. In time, Germany will see the British army of occupation depart. When will the British army of occupation depart from Ireland? Mr. Macpherson and men of his calibre think that Ireland can be terrorized into acquiescence by military suppressions or bribed into gratitude by doles. On paper these theories would appear excellent. A man might be forgiven for believing in them if he started his study of Irish history with the year 1919. Unfortunately, they have been tried successively and simultaneously for a hundred years. And their failure is familiar to all the world. When Ireland is quiet—so runs the argument—she is content. Therefore she does not want Home Rule. When Ireland is disturbed, she is menacing: it would be dangerous to give her Home Rule. The Irish are poor, and therefore they are discontented. Give Ireland British bribes, and riches will bring acquiescence in British rule. What madness possesses us that we should listen to these follies at such a time as this? Ireland today was never more prosperous and never more fiercely nationalist. The tariff reformers offered a solution in high artificial prices for Irish products. "What shall a nation receive in exchange for its soul?" asked Mr. Churchill in his Liberal days. "A tax on imported butter." Mr. Macpherson alternatively suggests education and sanitary cottages. But improved education has had no other effect than to create an educated class of brilliant young men even more resentful of alien rule than their peasant forefathers. And suitable houses and the raising of the standard of a nation have always liberated it to fight evils beyond

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that of mere poverty. It turns its thoughts beyond the economic struggle to a full national life.

The present condition, therefore, is pitiful. Britain suffers more than Ireland. In face of it our proclamations of self-determination in Paris die away into a dreary cant and snuffle. Everywhere nationality has thrown down all barriers. Everywhere the world is to be remolded on national lines. Committees are examining with ethnological experts the exact nationality of each people and each fragment of people. Poles and Czecho-Slovaks and Ukrainians fight fiercely for the possession of territory. Sometimes the test is plebiscitary. Sometimes it is language, or religion. Sometimes it is the shape of the head, round or square. But everywhere new states are being created in response to this furious uprush of national ideals. And every new state has its Ulster. There will be a German Ulster in Poland. There will be an Austrian Ulster in Bohemia. There will be an Hungarian and Saxon Ulster in Rumania. We carve out these kingdoms with unfaltering hand, in adjusting the map of Europe. Only our effort fails us when we come to our own problem at home. Why not a British Ulster in Ireland? For many years this so-called Ulster has been the spoiled child of the Empire. Its threats of rebellion were certainly one of the operative causes of the European war. Its subsequent implacable opposition to Irish aspiration turned all Ireland to Sinn Fein. How long is this arrogant minority to be allowed to stand between Britain and Ireland; to veto a reconciliation which all the world is wanting? There are a dozen solutions to the question without partition—given good-will and the desire to make a lasting peace. But Ulster—or the recalcitrant corner of it—has been encouraged by the whole of the British upper-class until it defies its own fellow-countrymen, and the British electorate, and the verdict of the civilized world.

It is evident that these things cannot continue. They form an open sore and shame. All the Dominions are protesting against them. America is protesting against them. The better mind of the world is protesting against them. Radicalism and labor will have none of them. Radicalism and labor will dominate the next Parliament. That combination will have little patience with or approval of Ulster's veto. Sir Donald Maclean quoted in last week's debate a letter from a distinguished author who has just returned to Ireland from active service at the war. "Returning to the country after four and a half years," he says, "I am really appalled by the scandal it presents of people governed by naked force: essentially the same system as in Belgium and in Germany; armed police, soldiers, machines, tanks, gas, etc.—all the hideous paraphernalia of war. The whole of it apparently to repress a people who are determined, in some way or another, to attain their liberty." Ireland demands today the recognition of a principle which is dominating the whole world. In return she sees tanks lumbering through the streets of her capital and aeroplanes vigilant overhead. Such displays—it is calculated—will in time make her loyal. She will accept British rule, and abandon Sinn Fein; and recover what the Chief Secretary is pleased to call her soul. Even Toryism protests against this criminal folly. Mr. Hills expressed profound disappointment at the Government statement. They "have no solution to give for the Irish problem. . . . Either the Government have got a policy or they have not. If they have not got a policy, it is the bankruptcy of British statesmanship. If they have got a policy, in God's name let them tell us what that policy is." He appeals boldly "to our own consciences and our own hearts." "I, as a Unionist, find the present position perfectly intolerable. We cannot go on as we are." These are courageous words. It might be well if Liberal, Labor, and independent Tory members got together to devise a scheme which they could force upon this nerveless Administration. But action there must be. We may refer the Irish problem to the Empire. We may refer it to the United States. We may refer it to the League of Nations. But military terrorism is impossible. The one thing certain is—"We cannot go on as we are."

Notes

IN a recent statement in the French Chamber of Deputies, M. Loucheur, Minister of Industrial Reconstruction, described the efforts of the Government to remedy unemployment and restore normal economic conditions. He called for the coöperation, industrial and financial, of all the manufacturers and tradesmen of France, and explained that the industrial enterprises which were being conducted by the state would not be allowed to result in any injurious competition with private enterprise. State-owned war factories were already, he announced, being converted into repair shops, locomotive works, factories for the production of telephone and telegraph appliances, etc. While M. Loucheur vigorously advocated international labor legislation, and announced that the Government had appointed M. Jouhaux, of the Confédération Générale du Travail, to serve on a special commission which would represent both employers and employees, he added that he did not believe the eight-hour day was possible in France. He declared himself a supporter of the general principle of commercial freedom from state control, although the present condition of industrial disorganization and the prevailing high rate of exchange rendered such freedom temporarily unwise.

FRANCE has sent a mission to French East Africa to study the question of food supplies for France, and especially to determine the possibilities of cotton culture by the introduction of irrigation in Lower Senegal and about the mouth of the Niger. Engineers in the region have reported that within ten years half the pre-war demand of French cotton spinners could be supplied from a strip of land 500 kilometres in length on both sides of the Senegal, admirably suited for cotton growing. The commission also reports that it is practicable to remove the bar which closes the Senegal and open the river to navigation as far as Podor in the season of low water (November to June), and as far as Kayes for the rest of the year.

THE French League for the Rights of Women, following the reception of its delegates on April 10 by the Committee of the Peace Conference on the League of Nations, addressed a letter to President Wilson thanking him for the assurance that he and his colleagues agreed in principle with the points submitted by the League, but informing him that an agreement in principle only was insufficient. Declaring that slavery, although abolished in principle, still existed in regard to women and children, the letter demanded the inclusion in the peace treaty of the following provision: "The contracting states engage to prohibit, under any form whatever, the sale of or traffic in women and children either as property, or for work or prostitution, or even with a view to marriage."

IN a recent issue of the Paris *Figaro* M. Charles Tardieu discusses the situation of the demobilized women war workers of France. Of the several hundred thousand employed in arsenals, factories, and various public departments, all but 80,000 have been discharged since the armistice, with the result that France is confronted with a new and serious problem of unemployment. Although the wages of women engaged in various war activities were less than those of men doing the same work, they were nevertheless so much better than those paid in the so-called feminine occupations that many of the demobilized women are refusing to accept the positions now open to them. Resentment is reported to have developed among the women demobilized from certain employments, particularly among women employees of the Bureau of Posts, Telegraphs, and Telephones, who, after devoted and in many cases extremely dangerous service, are obliged to yield their places not only to demobilized soldiers but also to the demobilized male civil workers who have neither military service nor experience to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recommend them. Very little has been done to meet the problem of unemployment among women, and according to M. Tardieu there is pressing need of some adequate plan of aid for the thousands of women who have been discharged without discrimination to make room for the men returning from the front.

A RECENT meeting of business men, called by the British National Produce Traders' League at London, adopted a resolution calling upon the Government "immediately to remove all the various controls on trade set up under the Defence of the Realm Acts during the war." Mr. E. B. Tredwen, chairman of the Merchants' Committee and of the Australasian section of the London Chamber of Commerce, presided, and the leading address in support of the motion was delivered by Mr. Walter Runciman, who stated that "seldom in the modern history of England had there been more widespread apprehension of misfortune and trouble in finance and commerce." He declared that nearly a million people in Great Britain were receiving unemployment pay, while manufacturers, on the other hand, had stocks of goods which the rulings of Government Departments prevented them from shipping to customers abroad.

SWITZERLAND, through a referendum taken last October, has amended its Federal Constitution so as to provide for the election of the National Council by proportional representation. It seemed desirable, after the general strike in November, to hold elections as soon as possible, and although the present National Council has served only two years of its three year term, the elections will take place in October. The regulations governing the coming elections, as prepared by the National Council, were opposed by the minority parties, and were finally amended by the Council of State by abolishing compulsory voting and permitting plural voting. In its altered form the bill was accepted and has gone into effect.

ON March 24 a conference was held at Milan of the Socialists who left the official organization of the Italian Socialist party in order to support the intervention of Italy in the war. Resolutions were passed providing for an organization with the object of substituting "Mazzini's humanitarian and educative principles for Marx's egoistic conceptions." It was declared that the Italians of Spolato and Zara must not be abandoned, and that the Bolshevism of the official Socialist party must be defeated. It is suggested that the new party, which calls itself the "Trincerista," or "Comrades of the Trenches," may have some influence on the elections.

UNDER the Swedish constitutional system the laws governing municipal elections are subject to revision without a constitutional amendment. The extraordinary session of the Riksdag last fall was able, accordingly, to pass sweeping reform bills granting full and equal suffrage in municipal elections to men and women without the requirement of a property qualification. These municipal elections have an added importance from the fact that the town and county councils elect the members of the first chamber of the Riksdag, and, in consequence, women already have an influence on the choice of the members of that body, although the Parliamentary suffrage cannot be conferred upon women without a constitutional amendment. In discussing the participation of women in the Stockholm elections, the *Dagens Nyheter* of March 28 remarks that an active part was taken by married women of all classes and by self-supporting women, especially domestic servants. The percentage of women who voted was smaller than that of men, although the actual number was larger owing to the fact that there are more women than men qualified to vote. According to the election returns of two typical districts of Stockholm, it appears that approximately one-half of the women voted. The increase in the electorate has resulted in changes in the voting strength of the various political parties, these changes favoring the Socialists, who now comprise 52 per cent. of the voters of Stockholm.

NORWEGIAN shipping losses during the war were greater than those of either Sweden or Denmark. The Royal Norwegian Navigation Bureau has officially announced that Norway's loss at the end of 1918 comprised 629 steamships, aggregating 1,031,360 gross tons; 178 sailing vessels, aggregating 194,777 tons; 17 motor boats, aggregating 10,591 tons; and 5 barges, aggregating 3,327 tons, making a total of 929 vessels, aggregating 1,240,055 gross registered tons. The loss of life was 1,155. At the outbreak of the war Norway's registered merchant fleet consisted of 3,405 vessels, aggregating 2,626,708 tons. The total loss, therefore, calculated on a percentage basis, is 24.11 per cent. of the vessels and 47.08 per cent. of the tonnage.

A NEW labor magazine, the *Rodo Sekai* or *Labor World*, has lately appeared in Japan as the organ of the Yuaikai (Labor's Friendly Society). A leading editorial in the first issue gives the following statement of the attitude of the new periodical: "Capitalists should take steps to make their interests and those of workmen identical; they should know that there is no capital without labor. Workers should try to elevate their character and to increase their efficiency, aim at the realization of the eight hour principle, organize trade unions on sound lines, demand a revision of the Factory Law so as to better their condition, urge the abolition of that part of the police regulation which imposes handicaps upon workers, and struggle to secure universal suffrage. The Government should on its part carry out a thorough revision of the tax regulations so as to place more of the burden on the rich, less of it on the poor. The peerage system, which constitutes a source of class prejudice, should be done away with." During the last few months the Yuaikai has largely increased its membership in industrial centres, particularly in Kobe and Osaka.

A RECENT issue of the *Japanese Advertiser* gives an account, taken from what are said to be official sources, of an advance by Great Britain of considerable funds to the Government at Archangel, and the "consequent establishment of Great Britain's interest in the great forest resources of northern Russia." The Archangel Government has accumulated since August a debt of 70,000,000 rubles on domestic loans, a part of which fell due on February 15. Bonds issued against these loans are being used as legal tender, making it almost impossible for the Government to raise more money by domestic loans. According to the *Japanese Advertiser*, Great Britain is counted upon to supply the necessary funds, for which large tracts of forest land will be pledged as security, establishing British interests permanently in northern Russia.

A WOMAN'S party, recently organized in Argentina under the leadership of Señora Julieta Santeri de Renshaw, has published a platform which demands equality with men in office-holding as well as in voting, and declares that any interpretation of the Argentine Constitution contrary to woman suffrage is "unworthy of the present state of civilization."

A DISPASSIONATE discussion of the Russian problem, entitled "The Conflict of Parties in the Russian Revolution," by Prof. Jacob Zeitlin, was issued in March as a university bulletin by the War Committee of the University of Illinois. Professor Zeitlin traces the course of the Revolution from the period of the Provisional Government to a recent date, with particular reference to the development of the power of the Soviets over the Provisional Government, the growth of Bolshevist control within the Soviets, the complete assumption of power by the Bolshevist Soviet Government, and the result of Bolshevist control.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED